DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 574 95 CG 009 201

AUTHOR	Peters, Herman J.; Slaughter, George F.
TITLE	Racial Interaction Between Counselor and Client as a Factor in Counseling Outcome. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Research Foundation.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-0-E-179-FR
PUB DATE	Nov 73
GRANT	OEG-5-71-0014(509)
NOTE	134p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$6.60 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Counseling Effectiveness; *Counselor Performance; *Helping Relationship; Minority Groups; *Negro Students; *Racial Attitudes; Racial Recognition; Research Projects
IDENTIFIERS	*Barrett Lennard Relationship Inventory

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine differences, if any, in the counseling relationships established by white female counselors counseling black students as compared with black female counselors counseling black students. The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, and California Test of Basic Skills were utilized in data collection and analysis. Also, an independent judge classified counselors into two groups, highly responsive and responsive counselors, for further analysis. Sample size consisted of 10 white female counselors and 10 black female counselors; each counselor counseled two male and two female black students for an average of 10 counseling sessions. The findings for this particular sample suggest the following conclusions: it is the individuality of the counselor which has the greatest influence on the counseling relationship with black students, rather than the race (of the counselor), or sex (of the student), or personality (of counselor-student similarity). Also, both black and white counselors tend to underestimate the degree of unconditionality shown in the counseling relationship with black students. (Author/HMV)

ED 096574

Final Report

Project No. 0-E-179
Grant No. OEG-5-71-0014 (509)

Racial Interaction Between Counselor and Client as a Factor in Counseling Outcome

Herman J. Peters

George F. Slaughter

The Ohio State University

Columbus, Ohio

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

November 6, 1973

The research herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official National Institute of Education position of policy.

CG 009 201

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

National Institute of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

I INTRODUCTION 1

Problem 2
Null Hypotheses 2
Definition of Terms 3
Significance of the Problem 4
Limitations of the Study 5
Organization of the Study 5

II REVIEW OF LITERATURE 5

Black and White Counseling Relationship Research 5
Black and White Counselign Relationship Barriers 8
Counseling Techniques with Black Students 11
Guidance Programs for Black Students 15
Counselor and Sex of the Client 17
Counselor-Client Personality Similarity 20
Summary 22

III METHOD AND PROCEDURE 23

Selecting the Problem 23
Selecting the Setting 23
Selection and Treatment of Sample 24
Selecting the Instruments 25
Processing the Data 30
Selecting the Statistical Analysis Approach 31
Summary of Chapter 33

IV FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION 34

Summary 41

V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 41

Summary 41
Conclusions 45
Recommendations 46

REFERENCES 49

APPENDIX A Letter of Approval 57

APPENDIX B Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory -- Form OS-F-64 61

APPENDIX C Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory -- Form OS-G-64 67

TABLE OF CONTENTS - (Continued)

CHAPTER		Page
APPENDIX D	Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (F)	73
APPENDIX E	Descriptions of Myers-Briggs Personality Types	83
APPENDIX F	Tables 3 through 24 - "F" Test Summaries and Mean Score Summaries	93
APPENDIX G	Barrett-Lennard Relationship Classifications	111

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page
I	Sample Group Composition	24
II	Test-Retest Reliability of the Subtests of Relationship Inventory	26
III	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Pre-Scores	95
IV	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for each Component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Pre-Scores	96
V	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores	97
VI	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for each Component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores	98
VII	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Pre Scores	99
VIII	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for each Component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Pre Scores	100
IX	Mean Scores from Students' Rating of the Counseling Relationship due to the Race of the Counselor	101
X	Mean Scores from Students' Rating of the Counseling Relationship due to the Sex of the Students	101
XI	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Pre-Score	102
XII	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for each Component of the Barrett-Lennare Relationship Inventory Pre-Scores	102
XIII	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores	103
XIV	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for each Component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores	103

LIST OF TABLES - (Continued)

Table No.		Page
XV	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Pre Scores	104
XVI	Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for each Component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Pre Scores	104
XVII	Multivariate Test of Significance Using Wilks Lambda Criterion Test of Roots for Differences in Rating of the Counseling Relationship Between the Counselors' Rating and the Students' Rating Utilizing Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores	105
XVIII	Mean Scores of the Difference in Rating of the Counseling Relationship Between the Counselors' Rating and the Students' Rating	105
XIX	Multivariate Test of Significance Using Wilks Lambda Criterion Test of Roots for Differences in Rating of the Counseling Relationship Between the White Counselors' Rating and the Students' Rating Utilizing the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores	106
XX	Multivariate Test of Significance Using Wilks Lambda Criterion Test of Roots for Differences in Rating of the Counseling Relationship Between the Black Counselors' Rating and the Students' Rating Utilizing the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores	106
XXI	Mean Scores of the Difference in Rating of the Counseling Relationship Between the Counselors' Rating and the Students' Rating	107
XXII	Multivariate Test of Significance Using Wilks Lambda Criterion Test of Roots for Differences of the Counseling Relationship with Black Students due to the Counselors' Classification Utilizing Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores	108
XXIII	Multivariate Test of Significance Using Wilks Lambda Criterion Test of Roots for Differences in the Counseling Relationship with a Black Student due to Counselors' Classification Utilizing Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Pre Scores	108
XXIV	Mean Scores of the Difference in Rating of the Counseling Relationship due to Counselor Classification	109

I. INTRODUCTION

The Black Nationalist movement has increased in scope, power, and force, moving from the community at large to college campuses, and recently into the junior and senior high schools. The Black Power advocates view the American society as institutionally racist, paternalistic, and materialistic. They pointedly reject traditional middle class values and norms. The Black Power movement has stressed the growing polarity between the white and black races. Militant leaders have often urged Blacks not to talk outside the "family." Because of this attitude, the effectiveness of the white counselor with a black student has been questioned. The white counselor is traditionally from the middle class, with a strong adherence to its values and goals. Many times the white counselor is seen as a representative of the school system and the "white establishment." If any understanding or sympathy for the social background and uniqueness of the inner-city black student's plight exists, the white counselor finds himself unable to communicate in the counseling setting. The white counselor can be caught in the dilemma of attempting to adjust the black client to the present society versus developing his individuality. To confound the problem, the Black employs a protective "communications mask," (Vontress, 1967) to prevent "outsiders" from getting too close psychologically.

There is evidence of this mask from the earliest period of slavery (Phillips, 1960). St. Clair (1951) found the same difficulty in working with Negro patients in a mental hospital. While it has been necessary at times for this protective device to be operable in terms of survival, at present it is used to maintain distance from the "enemy," the white establishment. It takes great skill and genuineness of personality for the white to break down this barrier. Previously, the Whites were the only ones to openly express prejudice and a desire for social distance, but recently the Blacks have become more vocal and open in this expression of distance for Whites. The movements of groups such as the "Black Panthers" and the "Black Moslems" portray this growing trend. Simmons (1963) discusses this reversal in expression of prejudices, terming it "Crow Jim" instead of "Jim Crow." Cothran, (1951), investigating derogatory stereotypes of whites held by Blacks, found 30 that were held to be true. He further found that lower class Blacks hold to the stereotypes more firmly, and with greater intensity. With respect to the white counselor in the inner-city school, his students would probably be more uniform and intensive in their feelings against white than the middle or upper class Black. Another factor that must be considered is the lower class Black's identification of Whites in the inner-city with punitive authority figures. The inner-city youth has little exposure to Whites outside of school authorities, truant officers, policemen, and landlords. This type of exposure is not likely to promote more active communication with the counselor.

Finally, interference in the counseling setting may result from lack of similarity of counselor-client personalities and values. This lack, in turn, may cause difficulties with respect to counselor empathy and positive regard for the client. Bender and Hastorf (1953), Cronback (1955), Rogers (1959), Hunt, et al. (1959), and Donnan, Harlan, and Thompson (1969) have found that personal characteristic similarities between counselor and client are related to empathy and unconditional positive regard. With the white counselor generally holding middle class "establishment" values, and the inner-city youth rejecting these values, real conflicts can result. It may be that white counselors, even if receptive to Blacks and being relatively unprejudiced, will have real difficulties in projecting warmth and empathy simply as a result of personality and value differences. Therefore, the white counselor faces a number of difficulties in counseling the inner-city black student. The basic question remains as to whether white counselors can establish an effective counseling relationship with black inner-city students. This is a very real and significant question in the inner-city schools today.

Problem

The problem of this study was to determine differences, if any, in the counseling relationship established by white female counselors counseling black students, as compared with black female counselors counseling black students.

Null Hypotheses

The problem of this study was examined through the analysis of the following thirteen hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the race of the counselor.

2. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a counselor because of the sex of the student.

3. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual counselor.

4. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual white counselor.

5. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual black counselor.

6. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship with a black student because of counselor-student personality similarity.

7. There is no significant interaction effect in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of counselor-student personality similarity and the race of the counselor.

8. There is no significant interaction effect in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of counselor-student personality similarity and the sex of the student.

9. There is no significant interaction effect in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the sex of the student and the individual counselor.

10. There is no significant difference in the counselor's rating of the counseling relationship established with black students, as compared with the students' rating of the counseling relationship.

11. There is no significant difference in the white counselors' rating of the counseling relationship established with black students, as compared with the students' rating of the counseling relationship.

12. There is no significant difference in the black counselor's rating of the counseling relationship established with black students, as compared with the students' rating of the counseling relationship.

13. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established in counseling black students by female counselors classified by an independent judge as highly responsive counselors, as compared with female counselors classified as responsive counselors.

Definition of Terms

1. Counseling relationship: A hypothetical construct to designate the inferred affective character of the observable interaction between a counselor and client restricted to client perceptions, as measured by the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (Barrett-Lennard, 1962).

2. Level of regard: It is "the composite 'loadings' of all the distinguishable feeling reactions of one person toward another" (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, p. 4).

3. Empathy: "the extent to which one person is conscious of the immediate awareness of another... It is an experiencing of the consciousness 'behind' another's outward communication, but with continuous awareness that this consciousness is originating and proceeding in the other" (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, p. 3).

4. Unconditionality of regard: "it is defined as the degree of constancy of regard felt by one person for another who communicates self-experiences to the first" (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, p. 4).

5. Congruence: this is "the degree to which one person is functionally integrated in the context of his relationship with another, such that there is absence of conflict or inconsistency between his total experience, his awareness, and his overt communication" (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, p. 4).

6. Highly Responsive Counselor: this is a counselor who is perceived by the students as displaying a high level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence in the counseling relationship.

7. Responsive Counselor: this is a counselor who is perceived by the students as displaying an adequate level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence in the counseling relationship.

Significance of the Problem

With the growing polarity of the two races, it becomes increasingly important that effective communication be maintained between races. The counselor could serve as a vital link in the communication process within the school setting. However, if a blockage of communication exists between the two groups, it is necessary to analyze the underlying causal factors involved. The inner-city schools, many with a large black population, must find effective means to bridge the gaps which exist in communication. One answer may be black counselors for black students. However, ideally, a counselor should be able to deal with any type of client, regardless of differences in race, religion, past experiences, etc. This study is designed to further understanding in this vital area. This study should have very real implications for inner-city schools, especially with regard to the use of white and black counselors. Hopefully, the findings would be considered in assignment of counselors. Too often, in the past, counselors have been assigned to inner-city schools on the basis of race or inexperience. Black counselors are customarily assigned to inner-city schools, whether they choose to or not, while the white counselors in the inner-city schools are generally inexperienced. The suburban schools are reserved for white counselors with experience and the greatest amount of training. This study could be utilized to redress this inbalance, with those counselors, black or white, possessing the optimum level of skills in working with inner-city youths being chosen for those positions.

Finally, this study could be of benefit to all educators working with black youth. Too little research on dynamics of counseling inner-city youth has been done. Educators have been remiss in carefully analyzing and researching the unique problems found in working with these students. It is increasingly evident that the greatest need within these schools is adequate communication between Whites and Blacks. With the growing polarity between the races, the white counselor could serve a vital function in communication, as well as facilitating change in the students.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to the use of only female counselors. The Columbus Public Schools employ a limited number of black male counselors; this is explained in part because of the fact that most male black counselors move rapidly into administrative positions. Also, there is an another limitation in that only black students were involved in the study. However, it is felt that in order to involve white students, one must devise a completely new study. It would be excellent to include white students in a follow-up study. A final limitation is that students and counselors came from 18 Columbus Public Schools, which were necessary to select in order to attempt to control for the variable of similar environmental experiences.

Organization of the Study

Chapter II presents a review of the literature directly related to the problem; Chapter III presents the procedures used; Chapter IV contains the findings and implications of the research data; and Chapter V gives a brief summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature will be divided into six main sections: (1) a presentation of black and white counseling relationship research studies, (2) black and white counseling relationship barriers, (3) black and white counseling techniques, (4) black and white guidance programs, (5) counselor and sex of clients, and (6) counselor-client personality similarity.

Black and White Counseling Relationship Research

Studies dealing with the question of who should counsel black students, are inconclusive. Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) and

Phillips (1960) suggest that effective counseling of black students can only be done by black counselors.

The hypothesis that white counselors would experience difficulty in counseling black students was studied and reported by Phillips (1960). He selected three black counselors and three white counselors who were Ph.D. candidates and were to use nondirective counseling methods. Each counselor was assigned two black male students of middle class background. The male students were referred for counseling because of noise, tardiness, low achievement, etc. The criterion for success was a reduction of poor adjustment to school regulations and better grades. After a semester of counseling, the counselors compared notes to discover mutual effectiveness. The white counselors experienced difficulty in communication, with the black male students proving very resistive to counseling. The black counselors were supposedly very effective with good rapport and adequate results in terms of adjustment to regulations and improved grades. Phillips concluded that white counselors can not establish rapport with black students. He stated that the white counselor-black counselee relationship is ineffective because the white counselors are unable to identify with the black student when rapport has been established. Further, the relationship is ineffective because of deep feelings of mutual distrust. Phillips goes on to state that the white counselor "can never achieve the degree of understanding which is necessary for adequately counseling black." He feels white counselors should undergo extensive self-analysis and extended study of the sociology of the black student.

These results may be accurate for this small sample; however, one should note several difficulties with Phillips' study. No control groups were employed, the groups of subjects were small (12 students); no statistical data were presented, since the results were the subjective accounts of counselors; and the criteria for success (adjustment to school norms) placed a real burden on the counselors' ability to establish rapport. Thus, there are several major concerns with the validity and replicability of these findings.

Carkhuff and Banks (1970) found similar results in their study; however, they were working with 14 white teachers and ten black parents. They found that both Blacks and Whites tend to communicate at low levels with other Whites and Blacks. Not only was there a lack of effective communication between Black and Whites, but they also found a lack of communication between Blacks and Blacks and between Whites and Whites of the same and differing generations. In general they found that Blacks tended to do relatively better with children than the Whites, while the Whites tended to do relatively better with the adults, perhaps reflecting some tendency for the more educated Whites to emphasize adult and verbal communication while the Black emphasized the words and feelings that communicate to the children.

Burrell (1971) also found that the black students in his sample at a large metropolitan high school perceived the counseling situation less favorable with white counselors than did white students with white counselors. To examine the nature of the black and white student attitudes toward white counselors, a small sample of students, proportional to the population in terms of race, and half male and half female, were asked to respond to a short 12-item attitude scale. In general, student responses did not reflect an overwhelmingly favorable attitude toward the counseling situation. When analyzed by race, the results did indicate that black students' responses to attitudinal statements directed toward the counseling situation, were significantly lower than White responses to that same counseling situation.

On the other hand, in separate studies Brown (1950), Barney and Hall (1966), Green (1966), Vontress (1968), and Backner (1970) concluded that under certain conditions, white counselors can adequately and effectively counsel black students.

Brown (1950) carried out a study involving the factor of race in establishing a casework relationship. Writing to 40 social work agencies in 13 states, Brown asked the heads of the agencies to fill out a questionnaire on the previously stated factor. In 80 percent of the cases reported, race of the counselor was reputed to be no obstacle in establishing a relationship. Personal adjustment, experience, and professional skill were viewed as more important than race. However, when white workers did experience difficulty, it was largely due to two factors; i.e., (1) a paternalistic attitude toward the black client, or (2) a denial of any racial feelings. In the second case, the white worker reacts to his own guilt and hostility by being overly sympathetic and concerned.

As the author has stated, the results were difficult to analyze or to draw conclusions from, because of the open-ended method of the questionnaire. In addition, one would be somewhat critical of the generalization by Brown that in 80 percent of the cases, race made no difference. She does point out a number of difficulties experienced, but eliminated these because of personality factors or inexperience rather than race. Thus, the study, carried out as an attitude study, has difficulties in the area of accurate reporting, interpretation, and generalization.

Barney and Hall (1966), using students' reactions to a questionnaire, concluded that there is no statistically significant difference between white and black counselors' ability to advise the black student. However, this study was concerned only with academic and vocational counseling, and did not include counseling personal problems.

Green (1966) believes that "with a special knowledge of the needs of the Black gained by studying his psychological and sociological background, a sensitive and sympathetic white counselor can structure an atmosphere that will allow the black student to express himself freely." Vontress (1968) substantiates Green's point and claims that to be effective in working with black students, the white counselor must not only understand the economic and social problems of the black student; he must also show more aggressiveness in making the black student recognize and actualize his abilities.

Backner (1970) surveyed 115 of 325 students in the SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge) program in February, 1967, at City College of New York. Three levels of SEEK students in the program were randomly sampled: students who had just entered, students who were starting their second semester, and students who were starting their fourth semester. Also, questionnaires were mailed to 42 students who had dropped from the program and 14 of these were returned. In July, 1968, all 408 of the full-time SEEK students at Queens College were mailed a 17-item counseling questionnaire. Of those that reached the addressee, 44.8 percent or 104 were returned completed. Finally, in April, 1969, another counseling questionnaire similar to the one in July, 1968, but with some modifications, was handed out. However, because the method of distribution was not controlled there was no way to know how many questionnaires were distributed (it has been estimated that about 150 were distributed). Backner (1970, p. 636-637) stated that if he is correct in his analysis of the reactions and attitudes of the majority of SEEK students, it turned out that when a black student and a white student become involved with one another, their own evaluation of that relationship still depends much more upon the intrinsically human qualities that each possesses, than upon their different skin color and background. However, this was a survey of a particular type of college student and one should be cautious in making generalizations and applications in all areas and types of counseling.

One additional study, Heffernon and Bruehl (1971), found mixed reactions from black students counseled by white counselors. They selected four black and four white college men without prior counseling experience and gave them eight hours of training in Rogerian counseling and assigned two groups. Each group was composed of three eighth grade black boys. The boys' reactions to counseling were assessed by paper and pencil instruments and a behavioral measure. The behavioral measure suggested greater preference for black counselors; however, some white lay counselors may be acceptable. Heffernon and Bruehl (1971, p. 37) stated that informal observation suggests that degree of acceptance of the counselor by the counselees may have been an inverse function of psychological distance in terms of values, beliefs, and aspirations, as perceived by the counselees. In looking at the findings one should remember that this study involved lay counselors with limited training in counseling techniques.

Black and White Counseling Relationship Barriers

Few studies have been carried out in the area of counseling barriers with black students; however, much advice based upon personal experiences, observations, and impressions, have been written in articles which point out possible barriers. Fibush (1965) feels that in attempting to eliminate prejudice from counseling, some counselors have over-reacted, establishing "colorblindness." Unfortunately, this has tended to minimize the unique problems due to race of the client. Locke (Fall 1969, p. 57) sees racism as only one of many personal emotional barriers which a counselor must face and deal with. He sees the existence of racism because of a breakdown in understanding, which is the foundation upon which counseling rests. Lewis (1969, p. 50-51) sees counseling bearing the scars and the burden of racism and he gives the following as an example of racism as a barrier in counseling. He sees racism by Blacks occurring in an attitude expressed that "Whitey" just wouldn't understand the problems of black students. Vontress (1971, p. 9) points out that countertransference can take place in the form of racism. Simply put, countertransference refers to the counselor's reacting to the counselee as he has reacted to someone else in his past. White counselors may unconsciously perceive the black counselee as he always has or as history has perceived other Blacks in the past; for example, the fact that black women having been perceived by many whites, especially white women, as a phobogenic object. Vontress (Summer 1969, 1967) sees the white counselor's lack of understanding of the sociopsychological background of the black clients as perhaps the greatest blockage in the counseling relationship. The counselor, having often grown up in or assimilated so completely the values of the middle-class environment, is deprived of an understanding of the cultures and history of those whom he would in some way assist. Vontress (Summer 1969, p. 273) admits that some counselors are more deprived than others, but suggests that perhaps the most deprived are those who do not realize they are deprived. Boney, Dunn, and Bass (1971) concluded from their study of 188 Anglo, Mexican-American, and Black subjects from the fourth and fifth grades in four elementary schools that counselors who are working with students from different ethnic backgrounds who are disadvantaged need to be aware of how the socialization of their students reflects in counseling relationship; lack of this knowledge can create a barrier in the counseling relationship.

A white counselor's values are seen by some as a barrier in counseling with black students. Kincaid (1969, p. 886) points out that while counselors formally insisted that their values did not influence their therapeutic endeavor, most now affirm that their own value systems determine a number of decisions they make regarding selection of clients, therapeutic method, and results to be obtained. The rejection by Blacks of fundamental middle class White values was one of the four stages that Miller (1966) viewed as causing a barrier and alienation of the culturally different.

A counselor's inability to penetrate the language barrier of Blacks can render some white counselors helpless and create a barrier in the counseling relationship. St. Clair (1951), Phillips (1960), and Washington (1968), caution counselors to be aware of the "communications mask" as a factor hindering the establishment of a therapeutic relationship. Smith (1967) points out that white counselors make a key mistake when working in an inner-city setting by being offensive with language and manners. Vontress (Sept. 1969, p. 13-14) notes that educated people, especially therapeutic personnel, communicate in abstractions and words that not only convey motivations, but that transmit, modify, and refine feelings as well. Unfortunately, such abstractions and fluency of the language is not characteristic of Blacks. Adkins (1970, p. 109) found in a vocational program that words and concepts used by clients and even black counselors, were not based on common experiencial referents. Lacking common experiences, words simply meant different things, not easily explained by words alone.

Another significant barrier listed by Vontress (Sept. 1969, p. 14) is the black student's lack of familiarity with counseling. According to Vontress (Sept. 1969, p. 14) "middle-class people have had from infancy a continuing series of relationships with professionals and friends who assist them in some way: the doctor, lawyer, and certainly parents and siblings... The roles of the assister and the assisted are clearly understood." However, with lower-class individuals Vontress notes that such roles are not as clear-cut and could be seen as barriers in the counseling relationship. Ward (1970) points out that the counseling relationship may never get off the ground because the client never allows himself to be a real part of it. Ward goes on to say that "Blacks' inclination to hold back in counseling situations conducted by middle-class oriented counselors, white and black, is viewed erroneously, as a lack of familiarity with counseling." However, Ward notes that "a visit to the barbershops, beauty parlor, prayer meetings, bars, stoops, and other hangouts or gathering places of black people would show that there are experiences in the ghetto that the client could transfer to counseling if he recognized associated elements, particularly a receptive ear."

Washington (1968, p. 207) points out another barrier that the white counselor counseling black students may encounter. He sees a barrier in relation to the Black Power's reluctance to discuss conflicts "outside of the family." This barrier of self-disclosure, he feels, makes the counselor's task more difficult and more challenging but not impossible. Jourard (1959) notes that to reveal oneself psychologically is another culturally produced blockage to effective counseling with black students by white counselors. Vontress (1968) stated that there is a great deal of self-hatred in the Black; that he is reluctant to disclose himself psychologically to anyone, including the counselor, and that he tends to be suspicious of anyone who talks a lot. This barrier of self-disclosure will be examined in further depth in the section entitled "counselor and sex of the student."

The final barrier that will be dealt with is that of the white counselor's image. Vontress (1968, 1970) feels that the black client sees the white counselor as the enemy, and the black counselor as the enemy's collaborator. Smith (1971) said, "the white guidance and counseling image as practiced in public and private schools is neither designed nor intended to revolutionize blacks..." The counselor image tends to be identified with school authority rather than helping individuals. Record (1964) points out that the counselor becomes caught in the bind of attempting to adjust the student to the mores of society and school, while also attempting to develop the students' individuality. One could list other possible barriers that white counselors may encounter in counseling black students; however these are most of the major barriers that have been discussed in the literature.

Counseling Techniques with Black Students

The articles in this section are based on individual research studies, personal experiences, observations, and impressions. The quest for techniques is another major issue that emerges as one examines the counseling relations with black students. The main technique that dominates the literature is the need for self-analysis by the counselor. Phillips (1961); Vontress (1967); Lewis (1969); Tolson (1972); Sager, Brayboy, Waxenberg (1972); and Daley (1972) all see the need for extensive self-analysis by the counselor. Tolson (1972, p. 738) stated that good counseling with black students "demands a peculiar and difficult type of honesty--the ability to question one's own motives, examine one's reactions, and analyze one's ways of making judgments and decisions." Sager, Brayboy, Waxenberg (1972, p. 416) feel that the counselor therapist needs to know himself as well as his patient. They said "a suppressed hard core of feelings about Blacks is one corner of self-awareness that eludes even well-intentioned middle-class white professionals." Daley (1972, p. 147), in a president's message, reminded counselors of minorities that "as we look outward to greater accomplishments, we must also look inward for deeper self-analysis."

Love (1965) urges the counselor to be flexible, creative, honest, and understanding; however, he cautions counselors to use test data with caution; counsel students as to a wide range of vocational and educational opportunities and use group techniques whenever possible. Deutsch et al. (1964) describes the characteristics of culturally deprived youth that might affect test performance; i.e., (1) less verbal, (2) more fearful of strangers, (3) less self-confident, (4) less motivated toward academic achievement, (5) less competitive in the intellectual realm, (6) less exposed to an intellectually stimulating atmosphere, (7) attending inferior schools, and (8) less knowledge about the world outside of their immediate environment. Clements, Duncan, Taylor (1969, p. 895) focused their attention on some of the factors which operate to invalidate or distort the results of both objective and subjective evaluations of students, particularly culturally deprived students. They stated the following factors which operate to invalidate or distort the use of test data, both objective and subjective, as a technique in effective counseling with culturally deprived students: (1) the incongruence between the value systems of the middle-class counselor and the culturally deprived counselee, (2) test weaknesses, (3) counselee rejection of test, (4) poor rapport between the counselor and counselee, (5) lack of a clearly understood purpose for testing, (6) inadequate norms, and (7) inadequate interpretation of test results. The conclusion drawn is that one should be cautious in interpreting results of tests to black students. Thus far a true "culture-free" instrument does not exist, although several closely approximate this goal.

Bellenger (1963) urges a team approach to working with what he terms minority youth, as well as a use of group guidance and counseling techniques. Love (1965) and Calia (1966) urge a group approach utilizing the powerful peer influence. Kincaid (1969) also emphasizes group techniques for black clients. He sees group techniques providing opportunities for experimentation with new modes response in a variety of interpersonal relationships and in a relatively nonthreatening atmosphere. Kincaid (1969, p. 889) said, "task-oriented group therapy requires participants to play an active role in planning and conducting the therapy and encourages expressions of initiative and industry."

Kincaid (1969, p. 889) also feels that besides group techniques, counseling with black clients ought to focus on actual rather than vicarious experiences and that the counselor should consider action techniques that are task-oriented which provide for the black student the experience of his "self" in interaction with objective and subjective reality. He feels that some black students have no wish to engage in the introspective self-analysis which characterizes insight therapy. Thus, Kincaid (1969, p. 889) sees an importance for activity therapy, eliciting individual expression through such activities as play, painting, dancing, drama, and singing.

Sager, Brayboy, and Waxenberg (1972) see not only actual experiences for black students to encounter in counseling as important, but they believe therapy begins where concerns are. They see little in the treatment of the black person that is not common to all good therapy. They stated that techniques developed in private practice are equally applicable to clinic population. Once a counselor deals with a student's most pressing environmental aspects of the difficulties, then efforts may be made to grapple with underlying psychological issues. Sager, Brayboy, and Waxenberg (1972, p. 419) conclude their opinions by pointing out that in counseling Blacks, one need not be primarily concerned with sweeping modifications of techniques, but rather with avoiding manifestations of racism and class prejudice. Banks (1972) also emphasizes the importance of first dealing with one's physical needs. Banks (1972, p. 583) said "a profession which, metaphorically speaking, ignores rats while professing to be an expert in the treatment of rat bites, retards any movement toward a more humane society."

The following articles from 1968 to 1972 describe additional techniques that the author(s) see(s) as of prime importance in counseling black youth.

Smith (1968) seems to feel that a sincere desire and committment is of prime importance to adequately counsel black youth.

Nelson, Nivens, and Smith (1969) believed that the counselor should emphasize such personal aspects as smiling, praising, encouraging, conveying appreciation, and touching.

Warner, Jr. and Hansen (1970) feel that if counselors are to help the alienated student to cope with the demands of the social structure, they must get out of their offices and operate in all parts of the school and community. Warner Jr. and Hansen (1970, p. 447) emphasize the technique of consulting with "significant others" in the student's environment.

Rousseve (1970, p. 337) describes an approach to counseling in school settings that transcends race. He calls his approach "counseling for rational self-renewal." Rousseve (1970, p. 341) conceptualizes counseling in this method as a learning situation in which the counselor uses a permissive, trusting relationship. He stresses encounter, confrontation, and emergence in the counseling relationship.

Tribble (1970) feels that by establishing a meaningful trust relationship and by understanding the concepts of gaming, brinkmanship, and show me, one has a better chance of reaching the desired objective in counseling, which Tribble hopes is to save black students from destruction. Tribble (1970, p. 300) defines "brinkmanship" as "a frequently used testing method by black youth to find out just how far they can push an authority figure before he or she will react in a manner which will predict a behavior pattern that can be gamed upon." "Gaming" is described by Tribble (1970, p. 299) as "a defense mechanism used within the black life style which offers the user alternatives to pain and a false sense of security from the unknown." Tribble (1970, p. 300) says "show me" is a more easily identifiable testing method because it has very obvious physical and masculine overtones. This method could be compared to "walking the burning sand." In this method before a black youth will accept your presence, you have to prove yourself by some overt display of accomplishment.

Lefkowitz and Baker (1971) relate some of their experience in counseling black students. They attempt to provide possible answers to how white professionals develop therapeutic relationships with alienated black ghetto students. Fourteen students were seen, seven girls and seven boys, ranging in age from 13 to 17. Lefkowitz and Baker found that the key to reaching a student was the willingness to reveal something personal about ourselves. However, Lefkowitz and Baker (1971, p. 293) believe that a counselor must be perceived as a human being and as genuine. They conclude by stating that a physical action approach appears to be an effective way (combined with the personal attributes of a counselor) to release tension, and learn of areas of interest to the counselee.

Wittmer (1971, p. 52) states that effective counseling with black students is based upon the knowledge, respect, and skill of the person attempting to counsel. Wittmer points out that statements of advice, praise, interpretation, or instruction are seen as impositions unless preceded by statements conveying cultural understanding.

Haettenschwiller (1971, p. 34) notes that style plays a part in how the counselor goes about counseling. He feels that for the white counselor, his style must reflect an outgoing acceptance of the other's blackness instead of the tacit avoidance which has been all too prevalent in the past. Haettenschwiller (1971, p. 34) states, "Only with both participants secure in their positions can progress be made toward an effective counseling relationship.

Vontress (1972) expresses that an individual counselor can hold whatever views he wishes, so long as he does not allow them to intrude in the counseling process, and does not allow the relationship to deteriorate into a rapping session. Vontress states that rapping may be fun, but it is not counseling. Also, he points out that rapping suggests that the rapper projects himself in order to get his point across. "The counselor, on the other hand, submerges himself so that his client can let his real self emerge," according to Vontress (1972, p. 578).

Clark and Walters (1972) conducted a study in which they attempted to learn whether counselors felt that special techniques and approaches were necessary for culturally deprived students. They constructed a questionnaire to survey opinions and attitudes of high school counselors about culturally deprived (CD) students. The fourth part of the question dealt with how counselors felt about various techniques and approaches used with CD students. They received 24 completed questionnaires, representing a 73 percent response. Seventy percent of the counselors were women, with 62 percent having M.A. degrees. There were 12 black and 12 white counselors. All were certified in Virginia as school counselors. They had an average of ten years of teaching experience and six and one half years of counseling experience. Two groups were selected from counselors on the basis of the proportion of students they considered to be CD students. Group I counselors had 70 percent or more CD students. Group II had 25 percent of less CD students. In group I there were ten counselors, all of whom were black; in group II, there were five white counselors and one black. Clark and Walters (1972, p. 208) found that the two groups differed in the practices and techniques that they felt should be used in counseling the CD student. Group I counselors were more often in favor of nondirective techniques than were those in group II. A direct, highly structured approach was chosen more often by those in group II than by those in group I. Also they found that the counselors in group I agreed more strongly than did group II that CD students should have orientation for test taking and job interviews. Finally, group I counselors agreed more strongly than did group II counselors that different techniques and special approaches were required for CD students.

In summarizing this section on "Counseling Techniques with Black Students," McGrew (1971) stated it very clearly after he had revised the literature that this section covered. McGrew (1971, p. 170) said, "It would appear that the decade of efforts to formulate more effective counseling approaches for disadvantaged populations has actually resulted in nothing more than a multiple identification of the problem, rather than incisive activities directed toward the solution of the problem."

Guidance Programs for Black Students

Frank Parsons is credited with beginning guidance for the specific purpose of helping white Europeans obtain jobs while at the same time black citizens who also had unemployment problems were snubbed. According to Paul M. Smith, Jr. (May, 1971, p. 724), professor of Afro-American Studies, University of Cincinnati, from the beginning of Parsons' writings on the purpose of guidance until now, guidance counselors have not been able to make the purpose of guidance work to the advantage of Blacks in school or out. Smith sees the white guidance programs as neither designed nor intended to revolutionize Blacks.

R. D. Russell (1970, p. 722), director of Project Opportunity at Nassau Community College, notes that black students generally perceive a guidance program as an instrument of repression, a well-spring of frustration and despair, and an anathema. Russell further states that the black students' disaffection with guidance programs had reached a serious point in its development long before the recent eruptions which have swept across the educational horizon.

According to Smith Jr. (1970, p. 706), in the 1970's black youth and their parents expect guidance programs to be more committed to the cause of black children. Programs must be action-oriented in fighting against all devices and systems than suggest dehumanization. Most of Smith Jr.'s writing indicates that guidance programs must encourage the development of the strong attributes of black children rather than dwell on the weak ones. Smith Jr. (Fall, 1971, p. 350) describes a revised guidance model for effective functioning in the desegregation process. A guidance program for black students should protect the right of the students (1) to be different; (2) to participate in all of the activities of the school; (3) to adequate food, clothing, and shelter; (4) to reject adult "phonyness" and lies; and (5) to organize for protest to preserve all basic human rights. Smith Jr. (Fall, 1971, p. 350-351) also see a guidance program for black students that is sensitive to the feelings, attitudes, and life-styles of the students that are served. This type of guidance program must have a counseling staff that will not wait for students to come to the program, but a staff that will extend help to the students. In fact, more time should be spent outside the office than inside. This type of guidance program will be more concerned with guiding students toward specific goals rather than perhaps counseling talk which lead no place. Group work with students is seen as important. The hours of work that this guidance program demand will be more irregular than regular. Finally, this type of guidance program will fight against the use of any test, regulation, or instructional scheme designed to instill negative concepts of self.

Washington (1968) thinks that a guidance program for Blacks should (1) provide a nonthreatening atmosphere where self-help can take place, (2) advise the school to include courses relevant to Blacks, and (3) get involved in the community with parents.

Cassel (1969, p. 106), in an article "Counseling with Disadvantaged," presents a philosophy of a guidance program designed for "disadvantaged" students. Cassel explains that for the most part this philosophy is not really different from traditional guidance programs, but in some instances the emphasis varies, and more of the priority of objective varies. Cassel lists the following characteristics of this program: (1) patience and understanding, (2) sympathy with firmness, (3) multiple agency support, (4) clear communication, (5) financial support, (6) single standards, (7) leadership development, (8) sensitivity training, (9) securing of job placement, (10) skill development from job analysis, (11) transformation of schools, (12) specially trained teachers, (13) cooperation of home and school, (14) individualized programs, and (15) cooperation and fellowship.

Hecht (1970) in an article, "Guidance Program for a Ghetto School," describes such a program known as the Center for Personal Advancement (CPA). This guidance program is different and often promotes ill-defined and contradictory things, sometimes all at once. Some of the things that the CPA guidance program deals with are (1) reasons for student nonattendance at school; (2) attitudes of the school's staff; (3) agencies and programs within the community; (4) problems facing students, such as helping students attempt to understand the school's bureaucracy; (5) finding jobs for poor students; (6) helping homeless children; and (7) follow-up; such as students who have become employed. Hecht believes a structure like the Center for Personal Advancement has only a small beginning in that direction.

Proctor (1970) feels that among the many functions of a guidance program, the most crucial component of a guidance program is one which enables significant input where course work and subject matter areas are being planned.

Bolden (1970, p. 207) points out that a guidance program to meet the needs of black students should be careful not to be centered only on the college bound or academically gifted black student. He feels such a program should be directed toward the identification of the talents in each individual so that one may become a productive citizen.

Finally, Phillips (1961) makes an interesting observation. He feels a positive guidance program for black students should be only a guidance program and not one especially for Blacks. He further states that this does not seem possible unless there is a mutual positivism existing between the American society and the black student.

Counselor and Sex of the Client

Although the literature on sex differences is voluminous, little is known about the interaction of the sex variable with either the counseling process or outcome. Some studies, however, have pointed out differences between male and female clients and between male and female counselors.

Dymond (Rogers and Dymond, 1954) notes the limitations of research designs which fail to consider the interaction of client and counselor sex. In commenting on the finding of significantly greater improvement of female over male clients, Dymond (Rogers and Dymond, 1954, p. 115) said, "If this result holds when female clients are counseled by females, the explanation would be of one character; whereas, if it develops that men counseled by women show more improvement than men counseled by other men, quite a different hypothesis would be demanded."

Jourard and Lasakow (1958) studied factors involved in self-disclosure with 20 white students and 20 black students at three Alabama colleges. The Self-Disclosure Questionnaire developed by Jourard was utilized to measure this factor. Their findings revealed that white students disclosed more than black students and that females disclosed more than males. These findings were consistent with those of Jourard and Landsman (1960) and Jourard (1961). Males in these studies disclosed less personal information about themselves to others than did females.

Fuller (1963), looking at the feelings of male and female students in counseling, obtained results which confirmed previous findings presented in this review of literature. Subjects were 32 university counseling center clients balanced by sex and preference. Half preferred male counselors and half had no counselor preference. Only those clients whose presenting problem was educational or vocational were selected. The counselors were nine university counseling center counselors. One male intake counselor saw all clients in an initial interview. There were eight regular counselors, balanced by sex and experience; each counselor had four clients, one male and one female in each of the two preference categories. Client statements during the intake and first counseling interviews were reported by counselors in standard case notes. Also, sessions were tape recorded and three tapes of male counselors and three tapes of female counselors were randomly selected. These six tapes were informally compared with their corresponding case notes to ascertain whether all topics discussed were included in case notes.

To obtain scores for feeling expressed by clients, the Kelly and Fiske Relationship Index was revised for use with a college population. The Strong Vocational Interest Blank-Men (SIVB) was administered to all clients to follow-up a hunch that "femininity" might be positively correlated with feeling expression. Fuller (1963, p. 38) found that female clients express more feelings in counseling than male clients regardless of the sex of the counselor. Fuller further hypothesized that more "feminine" clients, whether male or female, may be inclined to verbalize more feeling than more "masculine" clients, at least when masculinity and femininity are defined in terms of the SVIB M-F scale. Fuller (1963, p. 38) indicated that results of the study do not support the hypothesis that male clients express more feeling to male counselors than to female counselors. However, one must keep in mind that the presenting problems were all vocational or educational. If the presenting problems were personal, the reverse might be found.

Vontress (Summer, 1969, p. 273) indicates that this research suggests that counselors should find it easiest to establish a meaningful relationship with white females, first; white males, second; black females, third; and black males, last. Vontress (September, 1969, p. 15) notes that the combination which is fraught with the most anxiety in the American culture is the white female-black male dyad, especially if the male is between the ages of 16 and 30, tacitly known as the sexually dangerous period. Thus, Vontress, (September, 1969, p. 15) believes many white female counselors are beset with anxiety when they relate to a black male client in the counseling office. He concludes that the more the client represents the stereotype of the big, black, biological male, the more the counselor's anxiety is apt to increase. However, according to Jourard (1964, p. 15-16) the black male, the most disenfranchised person in the American society, is also the individual who is most alienated from his fellows and consequently from himself, because of the link between the way he feels about himself and the way he feels about others. Jourard (1964, p. 16-17) says, the "alienated man is not known by his fellows; he doesn't know himself, and he doesn't know his fellows."

More recently Burrell (1971), who was referred to in the first section, conducted the study designed to examine black and white students' reactions to white counselors. A sample of 50 seniors was randomly selected from a class of 474 students. Black students and white students were selected according to the proportion in the total class; half were female and half male. To assess students' attitudes toward their counseling experiences, the 50 students were asked to react to 12 attitudinal type items. Burrell (1971, p. 51) found that the average rating made to all items was highest (most favorable) for the white male studetns. The second number of most favorable responses to the counseling relationship was given by white females. The black male students responded less favorably to the attitudinal items than did the white students, and the black female students reflected a slightly lower attitude toward the counseling relationship than the black males. Burrell (1971, p. 51) speculates why the black female group reflected a slightly lower attitude than the black males. He feels the female black student at this stage could have more problems than the black male. Th[illegible]ck female may be confused by her changing role. Being the stalwart of the black race, can she now, as the black male becomes a stronger parental figure, Burrell asks the question, accept a role similar to the white female?

Cameron (1971) uncovered some interesting findings in a study of personality differences between urban blacks and whites. The sex and developmental differences in the white and black samples paralleled each other. Cameron (1971, p. 74) believes that this suggests that the differential social influences on the sexes and age groups are much the same for either race. Cameron further notes that these differential social influences are psychologically handled the same by either race. Both populations appear far more similar psychologically than different.

Boney, Dunn, and Bass (1971), in a study which was referred to in the section on barriers in counseling, found some interesting findings in relation to sex of clients in counseling. A total of 188 Anglo, Mexican-American, and Black students were randomly selected from the fourth and fifth grades in four elementary schools in a Texas Gulf Coast community. The breakdown was nearly even racially. One counselor was assigned six groups composed of 96 students and a second counselor was assigned four similar groups of 92 students. There were twelve 30-45 minute sessions conducted over a period of 18 weeks using 12 different stimulus topics. The procedure in the experimental situation was largely unstructured; the counselors were to provide a supportive and acceptable climate which permitted the subjects to verbalize as freely as they wished.

Boney, Dunn, and Bass (1971, p. 393) indicated that it was apparent in the results of this study that the black family which favors the females tended to reflect in their verbal assertion in the guidance sessions. The black males tended to be considerably less assertive on all of the stimulus topics except those dealing with human relations. In their discussion of human relations issues, the black male students were more active than black female students and responded less defensively and emotionally to the topic. Boney, Dunn, and Bass (1971, p. 393) conclude that the selection of discussion topics in which black male students have a special emotion investment, such as human relations issues, would facilitate their involvement in group guidance sessions.

Finally, Rochester (1972) conducted a study which investigated attitude changes of 229 counselor students. The constant variables were sex and age. The Test of Counselor Attitudes was administered in pre- and post-Institute sessions to year-long NDEA Institute counseling students. Rochester (1972, p. 218) concluded from the results that not only did the male and females appear to make significant changes, but the direction of changes for the sexes was the same; for example, more acceptance of Understanding attitude and less acceptance of the Probing attitude. None of the age groupings made a significant change on the Supportive attitude, which remained fairly stable. Rochester (1972, p. 218) suggests that it would be meaningful to continue investigations of counselor students, particularly, as related to the sex and age of the students. The fact that these variables are constant makes them amenable to investigation.

Counselor-Client Personality Similarity

The effect of similarity between the client and his counselor on the outcome of counseling and psychotherapy has been the focus of a number of recent empirical investigations. On the surface, the results have been contradictory and confusing. Gerald A. Mendelsohn (1962, 1963, 1965, 1966) has written a series of research reports of various aspects of client and counselor personality characteristics as they relate to counseling. In all his studies the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) was administered to clients and counselors at the Counseling Center at the University of California at Berkeley. The MBTI was used in an attempt to determine client-counselor similarity-dissimilarity. Mendelsohn found that counselor-client personality similarity is an important factor in successful counseling. The more successful clients were similar in personality to the counselor, generally scoring high on the intuition and perception measures of the MBTI, with a preference for intellectual and theoretical approaches to problem solving. They also have a strong ability in the area of verbal fluency. These findings are important, for the characteristics described rarely fit the black ghetto student. Calia (1966) pointed out that the black student often lacks verbal fluency, has a desire for action-centered counseling, blocks on self-disclosure, is less introspective, and less concerned with his self-concept. All of these factors may block interaction if the counselor employs the traditional techniques of verbal exchange and insight in counseling. Also, the counselor may be unable to offer empathy and positive regard to the student because of the major differences in personality similarity and counselor expectations of the client's proper role. Other studies in support of these conclusions were carried out by Bender and Hastord (1953), Cronbach (1955), Rogers (1959), and Hunt et al. (1959). However, Mendelsohn's study (1966) did indicate that client personality affects the decision to initiate counseling; but independent of the personality of the counselor, has little to do with the continuation of counseling. Mendelsohn further points out that while this conclusion could well be altered if a set of personality variables other than those assessed by the MBTI was employed, the failure of previous investigations to find consistent relationships between client personality and outcome measures argues that it may be generalizable. Mendelsohn (1966, p. 234) feels that at least in light of the results of his most recent study, it is a tenable hypothesis that who the client is, is of less significance to counseling than with whom he is matched.

St. Clair (1951), analyzing his difficulties with black patient in a mental hospital in Maryland, found the patients were overly suspicious or submissive, or expressed both attitudes. He felt that the therapist must institute a passive, nondirective role, being accepting and permissive. He also found a tendency among lower class black patients to act out their conflicts, rather than verbalizing them. Thus, the difficulties expressed by Mendelsohn were also found by St. Clair (1951).

McClain (1968) administered the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 PF) to 91 men and 46 women high school counselors in five National Defense Education Act institutes. The findings from this study offer support for the idea that personality characteristics relevant to success in counseling are not the same for men and women. McClain (1968, p. 495) indicates that one reason so many studies in this area have produced ambiguous results may be that men and women have not been studied separately. The findings indicate that the successful men in comparison with the unsuccessful were identified as more out-going, assertive, happy-go-lucky, venturesome, and liberal, while the successful women in comparison with the unsuccessful were characterized as more reserved, humble, sober, shy, and conservative. The high-rated men appear to fit the popular stereotype for masculinity and the high-rated women conformed to the stereotype of femininity. The women rated as poor counselors tended to score excessively high on such masculine qualities as venturesomeness, assertiveness, lack of reserve, etc. These findings may indicate that even though a black student's personality is similar to his counselor's, the counseling relationship may suffer because of the sex of the counselor and popular expectations as to how that counselor should behave according to his or her sex.

Kunce and Anderson (1970) conducted a study devised to test the hypothesis that counselors on intake will refer a client to other counselors on the basis of perceived similarities between the counselor's available and the client. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) was used in an attempt to assess both counselor and client personalities. Kunce and Anderson (1970, p. 105) indicate that the findings of this study suggest that perceived counselor-client similarities may influence referrals. Further they indicated that although counselors with defense mechanisms similar to their clients may be more capable of helping them achieve a better adjustment, such a similarity may be a hindrance.

On the other hand, some studies have been conducted which attempted to show that if a client-counselor personality is too similar, there may be a problem in establishing an effective counseling relationship where the client and counselor could be objective in understanding the clients' concerns.

Carson and Heine (1962) hypothesized and found empirical support for a curvilinear relationship between patient-therapist personality similarity and success of psychotherapy. Carson and Heine (1962, p. 28) reasoned that "with very high similarity the therapist might be unable to maintain suitable distance and objectivity, whereas; in the case of great dissimilarity he would not be able to empathize with or understand the patient's problem; in either case one might expect a decrement in therapeutic success."

Because of the important implications of this study, Lichtenstein (1966) undertook a replication study. As in the Carson and Heine (1962) study, the therapists were medical students who were treating an outpatient under supervision. The 54 patients were primarily neurotics and personality disorders; only one wad diagnosed psychotic. Of the 54 patients 14 were men and 40 were women; their mean age was 33. The same instrument, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and computational procedures used by Carson and Heine (1962) were used to assess personality similarity. However, the results failed to support the Carson and Heine (1962) study. Lichtenstein (1966, p. 282) expressed that the time interval between patient and therapist taking the MMPI might be responsible for the failure to replicate. Also, Lichtenstein (1966, p. 282) felt that it may be that current measures of both personality similarity and therapeutic success are too crude to demonstrate a stable curvilinear relation between the variables.

Finally, Carson and Llewellyn, Jr. (1966) conducted a study in an attempt to replicate the Carson and Heine (1962) study. Although certain modifications were employed, the sample contained 65 patients who were seen by a total of 22 therapists within the context of a public, university-affiliated, psychiatric outpatient clinic. The personality similarity index and the outcome-rating instrument were the same as those used in the Carson and Heine (1962) study. Appropriate statistical tests revealed no significant differences among the groups with respect to either of these measures. Two types of supplementary evaluations were also performed; however, these procedures failed to indicate any systematic relationships between personality similarity and outcome. Carson and Llewellyn Jr. (1966, p. 458) point out that Carson and Heine raised the question of their generality, particularly in relation to more "typical" clinical situations. The present findings suggest that the question must be answered in the negative. Carson and Llewellyn Jr. (1966, p. 468) believe that Lichtenstein's (1966) findings indicate that the curvilinear effect cannot be reproduced even in a setting that is highly comparable to the original one. Therefore, Carson and Llewellyn, Jr. (1966, p. 468) stated that they are compelled to conclude that it is at best a rather ephemeral phenomenon. In fact, they are no longer convinced at this stage of development that global personality similarity is either very fruitful or very workable as a concept. Carson and Llewellyn Jr. (1966, p. 458) recommend that future investigators in this area consider its abandonment in favor of more precise, analytical procedures.

Summary

This chapter presented a review of literature related to this study. First, a review of black and white counseling relationship research studies were presented. Second, counseling barriers that white counselors may encounter in counseling black students were discussed. Third, a number of counseling techniques that may be effective for white counselors counseling black students were described. Fourth, a description of several guidance programs that attempt to meet the needs and relate to black students was presented. Fifth, research studies dealing with the sex factor in counseling were presented in relation to both the client and counselor. Sixth, research in relation to counselor-client similarity was presented.

Chapter III will present the procedures used in this study.

III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The method and procedure of research involved selecting (1) the problem, (2) the setting, (3) the sample, (4) the instrument, and (5) the statistical analysis approach.

Selecting the Problem

The problem of this study was selected in conjunction with a need of the Columbus Public Schools, Columbus, Ohio, and the writer's personal interest in counseling with black students. The white school counselor is traditionally from the middle class, with a strong adherence to its values and goals. Many times the white counselor is seen as a representative of the school system and the "white establishment." Black students are being encouraged today by some movements to reject traditional middle class values and the white establishment associated with this tradition. Because of this attitude, there is some question as to the effectiveness of the white counselor with a black student. Can white counselors establish an effective counseling relationship with black inner-city students? This is a basic question which is facing all inner-city guidance programs. The Director of Guidance for the Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools indicated that this is a pressing question which their school system faces, as well as other school systems that attempt to counsel black students. After consultation and a letter of approval from the Columbus Public School system, the problem of this study, which was selected and submitted for funding was to determine differences, if any, in the counseling relationship established by white female counselors counseling black students as compared with black female counselors counseling black students (see Appendix A).

Selecting the Setting

The Columbus (Ohio) Public School System was selected for the setting of this study. The Columbus Public School District is a large city district located at the center of Ohio. Columbus is the 17th largest city school system in the United States and the second largest in Ohio. The school district maintains 127 elementary schools, 27 junior high schools, and 14 high schools. Preferred size for Columbus schools is 500-600 pupils in elementaries; 700-1000 pupils in junior highs, and 1000-1500 pupils in senior highs.

Selection and Treatment of Sample

The sample for this investigation consisted of ten white female counselors and ten black female counselors chosen from priority inner-city schools by the Director of Guidance of the Columbus Public Schools. Each counselor selected for this study had to hold a valid School Counselor Certificate issued by the State Department of Education, State of Ohio, and had to have a minimum of at least three years experience in education to ensure minimum training and competence level.

Each counselor selected two male black students and two female black students that she was to counsel during a semester of the 1971-72 academic school year. Table I shows the composition and size of the sample group.

Table I. Sample Group Composition

Number of Counselors		Number of Students per Counselor		Totals
White Female	10	Black Male	2	20
		Black Female	2	20
Black Female	10	Black Male	2	20
		Black Female	2	20
Total	20			80

As Table I reveals, 20 counselors and 80 black students were selected as subjects for this study. The students were equally divided by reading level, sex, and age. The mean age of the students was 16 1/2 years.

The treatment consisted of an average of ten counseling sessions, including a follow-up session, to ascertain if the subjects were being constant. The counselors were instructed to counsel each student for about one hour or school class period per counseling session. In addition, the counselors were instructed that the counseling sessions were to be largely unstructured; the counselor was to provide a supportive and acceptable climate which permitted the students to verbalize as freely as they wished. The topics discussed in each session were to be chosen on the basis of the interest the counselor evoked in the students; such as, understanding self-themes, unfinished stories relating to study and work habits, making friends, getting along with others, self-respect and family relations. A Relationship Inventory was administered to the students by their counselor at the first counseling session, and the Relationship Inventory was administered to both the counselor and their clients after the counseling sessions ended. Other information was gathered throughout the counseling session. Certain precautions were taken to help ensure that the students were reflecting their conscious experience of the counselor, rather than how they felt the counselor would like them to respond, or what they thought would please the counselor. The counselors were instructed to give the Relationship Inventory in a sealed envelope, and the counselors had the students return the inventory in the same manner. Also, each counselor was instructed to assure the students that their responses on the Relationship Inventory would not be disclosed to their counselors. Students were to be informed that they were participating in a research study and that the value of the data depended upon their actual perception of the counselor. This procedure was based upon a similar approach employed by Tosi (1968).

Selecting the Instruments

The nature of the information required for this study necessitates the gathering of data which focuses upon relevant perceptions of either person in a counseling relationship and upon specific personality factors.

The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory was selected because this instrument samples relevant perceptions of either person in a "dyadic relationship, in respect to the variables" of unconditionality of regard, congruence, level of regard, and empathy, each of which was described in Chapter I under definitions.

G. T. Barrett-Lennard developed this relationship inventory in an attempt to obtain an objective measure of the "necessary and sufficient conditions" of a helping relationship. Much of the development of the instrument was influenced by contact the author had with Carl Rogers.

The inventory consists of a total of 64 statements and six forms depending upon whom is being evaluated within the counseling relationship (Appendix B). Form OS-F-64 was administered to male and female students during pre- and post-evaluations of the counseling relationship. Form OS-G-64 was administered to the female counselors at the end of the counseling sessions with all four students (Appendix C). Of the 64 statements, 16 items representing each sub-score (level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence) are integrated throughout the entire inventory. A separate score is obtained for each of the four variables by appropriate summation of the respondent's numerically coded answers to each of the items representing that variable (Appendix G). Specifically, the relationship inventory requests a person to respond to the 64 statements on a six-point scale, ranging from a + 3 to a - 3. (Yes, I strongly feel it is true, and No, I strongly feel it is not true, respectively.) Since this study focused upon the initial interview and the final interview, the researcher was interested in each variable separately.

The issue of validity of the Relationship Inventory scales, considered in relation to the procedures used in developing and applying the instrument, and the original evidence of reliability and scale intercorrelation data, is discussed in the Barrett-Lennard's monograph report (Barrett-Lennard, 1962, pp. 6-7; 11-13). A content validation procedure was included, and is reported, in this original work on the instrument. Numerous studies have reported association between the Relationship Inventory Scales and other theoretically relevant variables. Investigations by Van der Verr (1961), Clark and Culbert (1965), and Gross and DeRidder (1966) disclosed associations between measures of individual functioning based on Rogers' psychotherapy process scale and Relationship Inventory scales. Hollenbeck (1965) utilized the Relationship Inventory for appraising student-parent relationships. Mills and Zytowski (1967) attempted to evaluate the psychometric structure of the Inventory. Mills and Zytowski carried out a principal-component analysis of the intercorrelation between the four subtests, for different populations and different forms of the Inventory. They concluded, on the basis of the unrotated principal-components analysis, that there was a general component which accounted for most of the variance (about 64 percent), a component which reflected a reciprocal relationship between unconditionality and level of regard, and a component which they interpreted as a relationship-distorting component. Walker and Little (1969) administered the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory to 150 undergraduate university students. A component analysis of the 64-item intercorrelation matrix was computed, and on the basis of this analysis ten factored homogeneous item dimensions were constructed.

The test-retest reliabilities for both forms of the relationship inventory and the equivalent reliability coefficients reported by Barrett-Lennard (1962) are found in Table II.

Table II. Test-Retest Reliability of the Subtests of Relationship Inventory

Subtest	Form MO (n = 79)	Form OS (n = 79)	Barrett-Lennard Data (n not reported)
Level of regard	.86	.74	.84
Accurate empathy	.84	.90	.89
Congruence	.87	.88	.86
Unconditionality of Regard	.80	.80	.90

Clearly, the reliability of the inventory is sufficiently high for its further use in the current study. The technical reliability of earlier versions of the Relationship Inventory has been assessed in several studies. Hollenbeck (1965) obtained split-half reliabilities ranging from .83 to .95 for the four Relationship Inventory scales. Samples consisted of parent-child relationships perceived by college students. Test-retest correlations were reported to range from .61 to .81 for the four scales over a six-month interval. Snelbecker (1967) reports split-half reliability coefficients ranging from .75 to .94 for the four principal Relationship scales, in separate assessments from two samples of data provided by observers viewing therapy films. Finally, Berzon (1964) in a pilot-study with a "group" form of the Inventory (e.g., "They respect me") obtained a test-retest correlation of .86 for the Relationship Inventory total scores. Her sample consisted of 20 students in four intensive groups, tested after the 12th and 16th (weekly) meetings.

The Myers-Briggs Indicator was selected for this study in an attempt to classify both the counselor and counselee personality type. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was constructed on the premise that individuals differ systematically in their basic preference with regard to perception and judgment. The theoretical methodology employed by the instrument is based on Jung's (1923) concept that mankind is equipped with basic ways which they prefer to use their mind. This instrument classifies people on the basis of their self-reported behavior, preferences, and value judgements into four dichotomous categories; i.e., (1) extraversion-introversion; (2) sensation-intuition; (3) thinking-feeling; (4) judgment-perception.

Extraversion or Introversion (E-I): directing perception and judgment on outer world of people and things or inner world of concepts and ideas.

Sensing or Intuition (S-N): perceiving directly in a factual, realistic way, or indirectly through associated ideas and imaginative implications.

Thinking or Feeling (T-F): judging through logical analysis of truth or falsity or through an appreciation of personal and interpersonal values.

Judgment or Perception (J-P): dealing with the outer world principally in terms of an evaluative judgment attitude or in terms of an understanding and perceptive attitude.

Myers (1962) indicates that both "perception" and "judgment" are key words in this instrument and are defined as follows: Perception is the process of becoming aware of things, people, occurrences, or ideas; judgment is the process of coming to conclusions about what has been perceived. Differences between awareness and conclusions would reflect in corresponding differences in interests, values, needs, and motivations.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator-Form F was administered to counselors and students and consists of 51 questions and 44 word pairs requiring forced-choice answers by the respondent (Appendix D). Each item calls for a choice between two contrasting alternatives; however; choices are always made within each of the four categories, never between them. Consequently, the four scores are experimentally independent and are not subject to artificial constraints.

In each of the four categories, the individual's score is based on the number of times one chooses one or the other category. One's "type" is then designated by the letters of his predominant modes in all four categories. With two alternatives in each of the four categories the number of possible type combinations is 16. Myers (1970) gives a precise description of all 16 types (see Appendix E).

The four categories have been found to be uncorrelated except for a significant tendency for "intuitives" to prefer a perceptive over a judgmental attitude. For detailed information on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator's validity and reliability, one should refer to the Myers-Briggs Manual (1962). The manual summarizes a considerable body of data contributing to the construct validation of the scores. The data reveal a number of significant relationships in the expected directions. The large majority of highly creative persons investigated, for example, were predominantly intuitive, a relationship that held regardless of sex or field of specialization. High academic achievement was found to be associated with intuition, introversion, and a judgmental attitude. Job turnover tended to be most frequent among introverts in active jobs, extroverts in clerical jobs, and thinking types in sales jobs; among those who remained in sales jobs, extroverted and feeling types were predominant.

A series of studies Stricker and Ross (1964) designed to investigate the construct validity of the Myers-Briggs Scales, suggests certain changes in the definitions of the variables measured in the light of their empirical relationships.

Anastasi (1968) in an evaluation of the Myers-Briggs indicates that the inventory is good as an experimental instrument.

An attempt was made to find out if the students in this study had difficulty in reading and understanding the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, and if they did encounter difficulty, how this affected the results of the study. Reading scores were obtained from the students' Testing Profile. Columbus Public Schools has a city-wide testing program that utilizes basically, the California Test of Mental Maturity and the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS). For a complete presentation of the Columbus Public Schools testing program and the Testing Profile utilized, see the Testing, Evaluation, and Research Notebook. The CTBS (1968, p. 5) is a series of tests with alternate forms for grades 2 through 12, divided into four levels that overlap in grades 4, 6, and 8. The designations of levels and the grades for which the levels are appropriate are as follows:

Level 1 - grades 2, 5, 3, and 4
Level 2 - grades 4, 5, and 6
Level 3 - grades 6, 7 and 8
Level 4 - grades 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12

Each battery of tests was developed to test skills in the areas of reading, language, arithmetic, and study skills. For the purpose of this study only scores from the California Comprehensive Reading Test were utilized.

In the development of the CTBS many procedures were employed to increase the appropriateness of the tests for evaluating the basic skills of students at the various grade levels in today's schools. Selections for the tests were chosen and items were written by classroom teachers of the grades included in the four levels of the tests, in cooperation with curriculum and testing specialists. This was done to increase the probability of well-constructed items in the language of the students, appropriate in complexity to the grade levels for which the tests were designed. Three forms of each battery were developed to allow for a reservoir of extra items. These tests were reviewed by two or three specialists in the skills area who provided both overall and item-by-item reviews. In addition, two teacher groups under the supervision of school curriculum and testing personnel reviewed the tests. The tests were assigned to teachers at the grade levels for which the tests were designed. The reviewers judged the tests on content, construction, and word difficulty. The suggestions were evaluated for use in the final selection of items from the three forms by California Test Bureau (CTB) staff in terms of the rationale and item analysis data.

The CTBS (1968, p. 6) was standardized on a large national sample of students from grades 2 through 10, randomly selected from all regions and states of the United States. The sample included public and private schools proportionate in number to actual enrollments. In addition, an Educational-Economic Index was applied in the selection. It was pointed out in CTBS (1969, p. 34) that no effort was made in the standardization to identify the race, color, or creed of participating students. It can be safely assumed that the minority races, insofar as they are attending public schools, are represented in the national norms. It is felt that the sampling techniques provided for proportionate representation of the minority races. The ratio of each minority group to the total sample can be expected to approximate the ratio of the total number of minority group students to the total school population.

Evidence of the reliability of the CTBS is presented in the CTBS "Technical Report" (1970, p. 29-52). Reliability was determined by several methods: (1) "Internal consistency" was determined by the use of the Kuder-Richardson formula # 20 for each grade (2.6-10.6) in the standardization of Form Q and for each grade (3.3-10.3) in the equating programs for Form R; (2) "interlevel articulation" is expressed in Pearson product-movement correlation coefficients for the overlap grades (4, 6, and 8), for both Form Q and Form R, derived from test-retest with adjacent levels of the same form at an interval of approximately two weeks; (3) "Interform reliability" is expressed in Pearson product-movement correlation coefficients for the middle grade of each level derived from test-retest with the same level of the alternate form at an interval of approximately six weeks; and (4) "Interlevel reliability" is expressed in Pearson product-movement correlation coefficients for the overlap grades (4, 6, and 8) derived from test-retest with the adjacent level of the alternate form at an interval of approximately six weeks.

Statistical data relevant to the validity of the CTBS are also provided in the "Technical Report" (1970, p. 53-80). The CTBS "Technical Report" (1970, p. 53) emphasis on the discussions of validity of the CTBS is on the steps taken in the development of CTBS to ensure content validity. Many procedures such as with the classifications of items, writing of items, editing of items, and tryout of items, were employed in the development of the CTBS series to ensure the appropriateness of the skills selected to be measured at each test level and to determine the level of skill that might be expected of students throughout the nation at the grades designated for each test level.

As indicated earlier in this section, for the purpose of this study, only the students' California Comprehensive Reading Test scores of the CTBS were utilized. The CTBS "Examiner's Manual" (1968, p. 7) indicates that the California Comprehensive Reading Test contains a 40-item "Vocabulary Test" and a 45-item "Comprehension Test." The reading vocabulary test requires a student to choose from among four alternatives the word that has the best meaning for the underlined word used in context in the stem of the item. The reading comprehension test measures a student's ability to comprehend the meaning of ideas by paraphrasing; to interpret what is read by identifying the main idea, perceiving relationships, drawing conclusions, and making inferences; and to extend interpretation beyond stated information and recognize the author's intention. The test is composed of blocks of items which test the reading of such selections as articles, stories, poems, and letters. For a complete presentation of the validity and reliability of this particular portion of the CTBS, see the CTBS "Technical Report" (1970).

Processing the Data

The data were keypunched on computer cards. Barrett-Lennard Relationship ratings given by the students were keypunched on computer cards for pre-ratings, post-ratings, and pre- post-ratings. Also, the average of all the students' rating of their particular counseling relationship was processed on computer cards, along with the self-evaluation of the counseling relationship as perceived by each counselor. The students' and counselors' personality traits were keypunched on computer cards. Then the counselor and student were placed into three classifications, depending upon the similarity in personality traits of the counselor's and their students. Counselors and students who had personality trait raw scores that were of the greatest similarity ranged from a raw score of 0-59 classification group; the next group had a raw score range 60-124; and the counselor and students whose personality trait raw scores indicated the greatest difference in personality were keypunched into the 125 and higher classification group. Several other classification groupings of counselor-student personality similarity were utilized but failed to indicate as accurate results as the system just described.

Probably the analysis of variance where personality was divided into three groups gives a better fit; that would mean the error term in the analysis of covariance is larger and may explain why the f statistics were so small and nothing was significant. Thus, the model used in the analysis of variance gave a better fit than the model used in the analysis of covariance; this is in reference to the analysis of post scores. If time had permitted, other group classifications could have been attempted. Finally, the students' reading scores were processed on computer cards. The punched cards were processed by the computer center at The Ohio State University.

Selecting the Statistical Analysis Approach

The Ohio State University Statistical Laboratory assisted in the selection and processing of the desired statistical analyses. The data were analyzed according to the purpose of this study. A nested design was used with four factors; i.e., the counselor effect, race of the counselor, sex of the student, and personality-similarity of the counselor and student. A nested design was used since a counselor could be of only one race. The levels of the counselor factor were nested within the levels of the race factor.

A variety of multivariate methods were utilized for the pre-, post-, and post- pre-data analysis. A multivariate analysis of variance for each counseling component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (i.e., level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence) was conducted. Also, a multivariate analysis of covariance was utilized in the analysis of pre-, post-, and post- pre-data.

For hypotheses 1-9 the following model, modified from Schaffe (1959), was utilized in the analysis of variance:

$$y_{ijkmn} = \mu + p_i + r_j + s_k + c_{m(j)} + (pr)_{ij} + (ps)_{ik} + (rs)_{jk} + (sc)_{km(j)} + e_{ijkmn},$$

where y_{ijkmn} is the counseling relationship scores for the nth counselor of race j, and nth student of sex k, both with personality classification i. The factors are defined as follows:

Factor P with I = 3 levels defined as $p_1 = 1$ for personality scores 0-59
$p_2 = 2$ for personality scores 60-124
$p_3 = 3$ for personality scores 125+

Factor R with J = 2 levels defined as $r_1 = 1$ for white counselor
$r_2 = 2$ for black counselor

Factor S with K = 2 levels defined as $s_1 = 1$ for male students
$s_2 = 2$ for female students

Factor C with M = 10 levels, defined as $c_{m(j)}$, is the nth counselor, $m = 1, \ldots, 10$, for the jth race

Also

$$\sum_{i=1}^{3} p_i = 0, \quad \sum_{j=1}^{2} r_j = 0, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{2} s_k = 0, \quad \sum_{m=1}^{9} c_{m(1)} = 0, \quad \sum_{m=1}^{10} c_{m(2)} = 0,$$

$\sum (pr)_{ij} = 0$ if either i or j is fixed,

$\sum (ps)_{ij} = 0$ if either i or j is fixed,

$\sum (sc)_{km(1)} = 0$ is either k or m is fixed,

$\sum (sc)_{km(2)} = 0$ if either k or m is fixed.

For hypotheses 1-9 the multivariate analysis of covariance will be described. The independent variables are as follows:

${}_1R^1{}_{ijkm}$ = reading vocabulary score

${}_2R^2{}_{ijkm}$ = reading comprehension score

${}_1P^1{}_{ijkm}$ = extrovert personality score

${}_2P^2{}_{ijkm}$ = introvert personality score

${}_3P^3{}_{ijkm}$ = sensing personality score

${}_4P^4{}_{ijkm}$ = intuition personality score

${}_5P^5{}_{ijkm}$ = thinking personality score

${}_6P^6{}_{ijkm}$ = feeling personality score

${}_7P^7{}_{ijkm}$ = judging personality score

${}_8P^8{}_{ijkm}$ = perceptive personality score

The model for the multivariate analysis of covariance is as follows:

$$y_{jkmn} = \mu + r_j + s_k + c_{m(j)} + (rs)_{jk} + \gamma_1 R^1{}_{jkmn} + \xi_1 P^1{}_{jkmn} + \xi_2 P^2{}_{jkmn} + \cdots + \xi_8 P^8{}_{jkmn} + e_{jkmn}$$

where symbols are defined as before. Also

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2} r_j = 0, \sum_{k=1}^{2} s_k = 0, \sum_{m=1}^{9} c_{m(1)} = 0, \sum_{m=1}^{10} c_{m(2)} = 0,$$

$\Sigma(rs)_{jk} = 0$ if either j or k is fixed.

For hypotheses 10-12 Hotellings' T^2 test was used to test the vector of difference $\left(\vdots\right)$. The vectors were level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence.

For hypotheses 13 a multivariate analysis of variance was conducted. The following model was used:

$$y_{ij} = \mu + t_i + e_{ij}$$

where y_{ij} is the ith counselor classification for the jth counselor.

Factor T with I - 2 levels defined as
$t_1 = 1$ for highly responsive counselor classification
and
$t_2 = 2$ for responsive counselor classification.

Summary of Chapter

Chapter III presented the selection of the problem, setting, and sample of this study. There was a brief description of the treatment of the sample, and a description of the instruments utilized in the study. Next, there was a discussion of the procedures used in the processing of the data of the study, and finally a brief description of the selection and the statistical analysis utilized in this study.

Chapter IV will present the findings of this study.

IV. FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter presents the findings and interpretation of the findings from the various analyses of data in the study. The findings of the study are presented in the order in which the hypotheses were stated in Chapter I. Each hypothesis was tested statistically with the minimal level of acceptance at the 0.01 level of significance. For the first nine hypotheses, a "u" statistic was derived from the multivariate analysis and the "u" statistic was transformed to an "f" statistic. In general it is approximately an "f" statistic.

1. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the race of the counselor.

A summary of the results from the multivariate analysis of variance and covariance for the pre-, post-, and post/pre data analysis related to hypothesis one, are presented in Tables III-VIII and XI-XVI (Appendix F). For this particular sample, there was no significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the race of the counselor. This was also true for both analysis of variance and covariance of the four components; i.e., level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence. It should be noted that as one interprets these findings one should keep in mind that these were averaged over the four factors; i.e., counselor effect, race effect (of the counselor), sex effect (of the student), and personality effect (of the counselor and student). Even though there was no significant difference in the relationship established with a black student because of race of the counselor, the mean scores located in Table IX indicate that the white counselors achieved slightly lower evaluations with regard to the level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence. However, the results of the post testing indicated that this situation had reversed. The mean scores for level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence were slightly higher for the white counselors as compared with the black counselors. It appears that as the black students became acquainted with the white counselors, their opinion of the relationship improved. Also, it should be pointed out, that almost all the counseling relationships were rated as either average, good, or excellent during both pre and post testing.

2. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a counselor because of the sex of a black student.

A summary of the results from the multivariate analysis of variance and covariance for the pre-, post-, and post/pre-data analysis related to hypothesis two are presented in Tables III-VIII and XI-XVI (Appendix F). For this particular sample there was no significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a counselor because of the sex of a black student. Sex of the student did not appear to be an important factor in the counseling relationship. This result was also true for both the variance and covariance of the four components; i.e., level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence. The only exception was in the multivariate analysis of variance for the post/pre-data analysis of the four components. Here the level of regard component was significant at the 0.01 level of significance. The mean scores in relation to this analysis due to the sex of the student, located in Table X, indicate that on all four components the male students rated the counseling relationship with the female counselor slightly lower than the female student rated the counseling relationship. Also, the mean scores indicate that male students rated the counseling relationship slightly lower at the post-testing as compared to the pre-testing. The female students rated the counseling relationship slightly higher at the last counseling sessions as compared to the first counseling session. This is not surprising, since most studies of a counseling relationship indicate that the females usually rate a counseling relationship higher than males rate a counseling relationship. But it is interesting that the male students, in general, did not evaluate the relationship higher at the post-testing.

3. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual counselor.

A summary of the results from the multivariate analysis of variance and covariance for pre-, post-, and post/pre-data analysis related to hypothesis three are presented in Tables III-VIII and XI-XVI (Appendix F). For this particular sample, the results from the pre- and post-pre testing indicate that there is no significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual counselor. This was also true for both analysis of variance and covariance of the four components; level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence. The results from the post data multivariate analysis of covariance continues to indicate that there is no significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual counselor. However, the results from the post-data multivariate analysis of variance indicates that for this particular sample, there is a significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual counselor. Thus, it appears that after a student became acquainted with his counselor, hiw views of the counselor might change in either a positive or negative direction depending upon the "charisma" of that particular counselor. The results from the post-data multivariate analysis of variance of the four components tends to support this finding. There is a significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance in the level of regard and unconditionality shown by individual female counselors counseling black students. Thus, it appears that rather than the race of the counselor or sex of the student, the individual counselor is what may be making a difference in the counseling relationship with this particular sample of black students.

4. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual white counselor.

5. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual black student.

A summary of the results from the multivariate analysis of variance and covariance for pre-, post-, and post/pre-data analysis related to hypotheses four and five are presented in Tables III-VIII and XI-XVI (Appendix F). For this particular sample the results from the pre- and post/pre-data analysis indicate that there is no significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual white counselor or an individual black counselor.

This was also true for both analysis of variance and covariance of the four components; i.e., level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence. The results from the post-data multivariate analysis of covariance continues to indicate that there is no significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual white counselor or an individual black counselor. However, the results from the post-data multivariate analysis of variance indicates that for this particular sample there is a significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual white counselor or an individual black counselor.

Thus, it appears that both white and black counselors are contributing to the results found and described in relation to hypothesis three post-data multivariate analysis of variance which indicated that for this particular sample there is a significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual counselor. Results similar to those found and described in relation to hypothesis three were found in the post-data multivariate analysis of variance of the four components; i.e., level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence. There is a significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance in the level of regard shown by individual white counselors; and a signficant differency at the 0.05 level of significance in unconditionality shown by individual black counselors. Thus, it appears that perhaps for this particular sample a number of students see certain individual white counselors as lacking in the level of regard that they convey in the counseling relationship. While a number of students see certain individual black counselors placing some conditions upon the counseling relationship. But again it is important to note that even though both the individual black and white counselors may be factors to consider in effecting the counseling relationship either positively or negatively, nearly all the counseling relationships at the conclusion of the study were evaluated by the black students as either average, above average, or excellent.

6. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the counselor-student personality similarity.

A summary of the results from the multivariate analysis of variance for the pre-, post-, and post/pre-data analysis related to hypothesis six are presented in Tables III-VIII (Appendix F). For this particular sample there was no significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the counselor-student personality similarity. The combination of counselor-student personality similarity does not appear to be an important factor in the counseling relationship. This finding is also true for the analysis of variance of the four components; i.e., level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence.

7. There is no significant interaction effect in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the personality of the counselor and student and the race of the counselor.

A summary of the results from the multivariate analysis of variance for the pre-, post-, and post/pre-data analysis is related to hypothesis seven is presented in Tables III-VIII (Appendix F). For this particular sample there was no interaction effect at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the personality of the counselor and student and race of the counselor. It appears that the interaction effect due to the personality of the counselor and student and race of the counselor is not an important factor in the counseling relationship. This finding is also true for the pre-, post-, and post/pre-data analysis of variance of the four components; i.e., level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence.

8. There is no significant interaction effect in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the personality of the counselor and student and the sex of the student.

A summary of the results from the multivariate analysis of variance for pre-, post-, and post/pre-data analysis related to hypothesis eight is presented in Tables III-VIII. For this particular sample the results from the pre-, post-, and post/pre-data analysis indicate that there is no significant interaction effect at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the personality of the counselor and student and the sex of the student. This result was also true for the pre- and post-data analysis of variance of the four components; i.e., level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence. The only exception indicated was in the multivariate analysis of variance for the post/pre-data analysis of the four components. Here, the congruence component was significant at the 0.01 level of significance.

9. There is no significant interaction effect in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the sex of the student and the individual counselor.

A summary of the results from the multivariate analysis of variance for pre-, post-, and post/pre-data analysis related to hypothesis nine is presented in Tables III-VIII. For this particular sample the results from the pre-, post-, and post/pre-data analysis indicate that there is no significant interaction effect at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the sex of the student and the individual counselor. This supports earlier findings reported on in reference to sex of the student not appearing to be a strong influence in the success of the counseling relationship. The pre-, post-, and post/pre-data analysis of variance of the four components (level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence) revealed the same results; i.e., nothing was significant.

10. There is no significant difference in the counselors' rating of the counseling relationship established with black students, as compared with the students' rating of the relationship.

A summary of the results from the multivariate test of significance related to hypothesis ten is presented in Table XVII (Appendix F). For this particular sample the results from the post-data analysis indicate that there is a significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counselors' rating of the counseling relationship established with black students, as compared with the students' rating of the counseling relationship. The mean scores in Table XVIII indicate that the counselors were underestimating their effectiveness within the counseling relationship, especially in the case of the component, "unconditionality." Only in the case of the component, "level of regard," did the counselors overestimate their effectiveness. These findings appear to be supported further by the multivariate analysis of each of the components; i.e., level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence. The results from the post-data multivariate analysis indicated that for this particular sample the component of unconditionality is significant at the 0.01 level of significance. The counselors underestimated the degree of unconditionality shown in the counseling relationship.

11. There is no significant difference in the white counselors' rating of the counseling relationship established with black students, as compared with the students' rating of the counseling relationship.

12. There is no significant difference in the black counselors' rating of the counseling relationship established with black students, as compared with the students' rating of the counseling relationship.

A summary of the results from the multivariate test of significance related to hypotheses eleven and twelve is presented in Tables XIX and XX, respectively. For this particular sample the results from the post-data analysis indicate that there is no significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the white counselors' or black counselors' rating of the counseling relationship established with black students, as compared with the students' rating of the counseling relationship. This result was also true for the multivariate analysis of three of the components; i.e., level of regard, empathy, and congruence. The only exception was with the component, "unconditionality" which was significant at the 0.05 level of significance for both white and black counselors.

In the case of this component of "unconditionality" both the white and black counselors underestimated the degree of unconditionality shown in the counseling relationship. This result lends further support to the similar findings in the analysis of hypotheses ten, for the component unconditionality was significant at the 0.01 level of significance. It appears from the findings revealed in the analysis of hypotheses eleven and twelve that both the white and black counselors were contributing to hypotheses ten being significant. Both the white and black counselors indicated that they were underestimating their effectiveness with the counseling relationship, especially in the case of the component, "unconditionality." For the white counselors, only in the case of the component "level of regard" did they overestimate their effectiveness; and for the black counselors in the case of level of regard and congruence, there is indicated an overestimation of their effectiveness in the counseling relationship. It appears that for this particular sample the black counselors tended to overestimate their effectiveness in the counseling relationship with black students a little more than the white counselors; whereas, the white counselors tended to underestimate their effectiveness a little more than the black counselors. Based upon the student evaluations, both black and white counselors should have a more realistic picture as to how the black student views the counseling session. It would be hoped that from these findings white counselors would have a little better estimate of their effectiveness in counseling black students.

13. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established in counseling black students by female counselors rated as highly responsive counselors by an independent judge, as compared with female counselors rated as a responsive counselor by an independent judge.

A summary of the results from the multivariate test of significance related to hypotheses thirteen is presented in Tables XXII and XXIII (Appendix F). For this particular sample the results from the post-, and post/pre-data analysis indicate that there was no significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established in counseling black students by a female counselor rated as a highly responsive counselor by an independent judge as compared with a female counselor rated as a responsive counselor by an independent judge. This finding was also true for the post- and post/pre-multivariate test of significance for the four components; i.e., level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence. The post- and post/pre-scores related to hypotheses thirteen are presented in Table XXIII. The post mean scores tend to indicate that the counselors classified as highly responsive counselors received only slightly higher ratings from their students as compared to the counselors classified as responsive counselors. The post-pre mean scores indicate that the counselors classified as highly responsive counselors received from their students lower post ratings as compared to the pre ratings for the following components of the counseling relationship: level of regard, empathy, and congruence. The counselors classified as responsive counselors received from their students lower post ratings as compared to the pre ratings only in the empathy component of the counseling relationship. One can only speculate as to why the counselors classified as highly responsive counselors by an independent judge did not receive significantly higher ratings as compared to the counselors classified as responsive counselors, or as to why the counselors rated as highly responsive received lower evaluations on the post evaluations as compared to the pre-evaluations. It may be that much more than the subjective opinion of an independent judge is needed in classifying the counselors. Possibly some of the independent judge's own biases as to what comprises the classification of the counselors into two categories affected the resultant findings. One could list more possible reasons as to why the female counselors classified as highly responsive counselors did not receive significantly higher ratings from their students as compared with the female counselors classified as responsive counselors.

Summary

Chapter IV presented the findings and interpretation of the findings from the various analyses of the data in the study. The findings and interpretations of the study were presented in the order in which the hypotheses were stated in Chapter I. The following chapter will present the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of this study.

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is divided into the following three parts: summary, conclusions, and recommendations. The summary contains a synopsis of the findings and the conclusions are based upon these data. The recommendations suggest further areas for research.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine differences, if any, in the counseling relationship established by white female counselors counseling black students as compared with black female counselors counseling black students.

Student and counselor perception of the counseling relationship was measured by the use of the *Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory*. The inventory consists of a total of 64 statements that attempt to measure the level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence shown in a counseling relationship. The *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* was selected in an attempt to classify both the counselor and their counselees' personality types. This instrument classifies people on the basis of their self-reported behavior, preferences, and value judgments into four dichotomous categories; i.e., (1) extraversion-introversion, (2) sensation-intuition, (3) thinking-feeling, and (4) judgment-perception. In an attempt to determine if the students in this study had difficulty in reading and understanding the *Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory* and the *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*, the students' reading vocabulary scores and reading comprehension scores from the California Comprehensive Reading Test of the *California Test of Basic Skills* were utilized. The reading vocabulary test requires a student to choose from among four alternatives the word that has the best meaning for the underlined word used in context in the stem of the item. The reading comprehension test measures a student's ability to comprehend the meaning of ideas by paraphrasing; to interpret what is read by identifying the main idea, to perceive relationships, to draw conclusions, and to make inferences; to extend interpretation beyond stated information; and to recognize the author's intention. In order to attempt to determine whether performance of counselors contributed to the success of counseling relationships, counselors were classified by an independent judge as either highly responsive or responsive.

The sample consisted of ten white female counselors and ten black female counselors, chosen from priority inner-city schools in a mid-western city by the director of guidance for that public school system. Each counselor selected two male black students and two female black students that she was to counsel during the 1971-72 academic year.

The treatment consisted of an average of ten counseling sessions, including a follow-up session, to ascertain if the subjects were being constant. The students participated in a pre- and post-testing which utilized the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory, while the counselor took the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory only during the post-testing.

The statistical analysis approach was determined after consultation with the staff of the Statistical Laboratory at The Ohio State University. A nested design was used with four factors; i.e., the counselor effect, race effect (of the counselor), sex effect (of the student), and personality similarity of counselor-student. A nested design was utilized since a counselor can be of only one race. The levels of the counselor factor were nested within the levels of the race factor. A variety of multivariate methods was utilized for the pre-, post-, and post/pre-data analysis. Also, a univariate analysis was conducted for each component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory: level of regard, empathy, unconditionality, and congruence.

A "u" statistic was derived from the multivariate analysis and the u statistic was transformed to an "f" statistic. In general, it is approximately an "f" statistic. A critical value at the 0.01 level of significance was employed, except in the analysis of hypotheses 3, 4, 5, 11, and 12, in which a critical value at the 0.05 level of significance was also employed.

The findings of the study were obtained by a variety of multivariate methods. The findings were presented in the order in which the hypotheses were stated in Chapter I.

1. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the race of the counselor.

A review of the findings indicates that hypotheses 1 should be accepted.

2. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the sex of the student.

Hypotheses 2 should be accepted, except in the post-pre analysis where level of regard was significant at the 0.01 level of significance.

3. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual counselor.

Hypotheses 3 should be partially rejected. The results from the post data analysis indicated that there was a significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance in the level of regard and unconditionality shown by the individual female counselors. However, results from all the other analyses related to hypotheses 3, indicated that the hypotheses should be accepted.

4. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual white counselor.

5. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of an individual black counselor.

Hypotheses 4 and 5 should be partially rejected. The results from the post data analysis indicated there was a significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance for both individual white and black counselors. The post data analysis also indicated that there was a significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance in the level of regard shown by individual white counselors, and a significant difference at the 0.05 level of significance in unconditionality shown by individual black counselors. However, results from all the other analyses related to hypotheses 4 and 5, indicated that hypotheses 4 and 5 should be accepted.

6. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of counselor-student personality similarity.

A review of the findings indicated hypotheses 6 should be accepted; there was no significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance.

7. There is no significant interaction effect in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of counselor-student personality similarity and the race of the counselor.

Hypotheses 7 should be accepted. There was no significant interaction effect at the 0.01 level of significance.

8. There is no interaction effect in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of counselor-student personality similarity and the sex of the student.

The findings indicated that hypotheses 8 should be accepted; there was no interaction effect at the 0.01 level of significance.

9. There is no significant interaction effect in the counseling relationship established with a black student because of the sex of the student and the individual counselor.

Hypotheses 9 was accepted. All the results in relation to this hypotheses indicated that there was no significant interaction effect at the 0.01 level of significance.

10. There is no significant difference in the counselors' rating of the counseling relationship established with black students, as compared with students' rating of the counseling relationship.

Hypotheses 10 should be partially rejected. The results from the post data analysis indicated that there was significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counselors' rating of the counseling relationship as compared with the students' rating of the counseling relationship. The results from the post data analysis also indicated that the counseling component of unconditionality was significant at the 0.01 level of significance. The counselors were underestimating the degree of unconditionality that they were placing upon the counseling relationship.

11. There is no significant difference in the white counselors' ratin of the counseling relationship established with black students as compared with the students' rating of the counseling relationship.

12. There is no significant difference in the black counselors' rating of the counseling relationship established with black students, as compared with the students' rating of the counseling relationship.

Hypotheses 11 and 12 should be accepted, except for the post data analysis where the counseling component of unconditionality was signicant at the 0.05 level of significance for both white and black counselors. Both the white and black counselors underestimated the degree of unconditionality shown in the counseling relationship. All other post data analysis indicated that there was no significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the white or black counselors' rating of the counseling relationship.

13. There is no significant difference in the counseling relationship established in counseling black students by female counselors classified by an independent judge as highly responsive counselors, as compared with female counselors classified as responsive counselors.

Hypotheses 13 should be accepted. The results from the post and post-pre data analysis indicated that there was no significant difference at the 0.01 level of significance in the counseling relationship established with black students by female counselors classified by an independent judge as highly responsive counselors as compared to female counselors classified as responsive counselors.

Conclusions

The conclusions derived from the analysis of the data are presented as they relate to the purpose and progress of the study. It is recognized that the conclusions based on the findings of this research are primarily applicable to the population which was studied. Generalizations of the findings may be made to comparable populations; however, professional caution should be exercised in making generalizations of the findings to populations which might differ significantly from the population which was studied.

The findings of this particular sample suggest the following conclusions:

1. The race of the counselor did not appear to be a major factor in determining whether the counseling relationship with a black student was perceived as an effective relationship. The race effect (of the counselor) not only failed to be significant at the 0.01 level of significance, but the quality of the counseling relationship with both black and white counselors was rarely rated to be poor by the counselees.

2. The sex of the student did not appear to be an important factor influencing the effectiveness of the counseling relationship. The only thing noticeably happening in relation to the sex effect (of the student) was that the male students tended to rate the counseling relationship slightly lower than did the females.

3. The personality effect of both counselor and student did not appear to be an important factor influencing the counseling relationship.

4. The individual counselor, rather than the race effect of the counselor; the sex effect of the student; and the personality effect appeared to have the greatest influence upon the counseling relationship. This appeared to be true for both individual black and white counselors. The quality of the counseling relationship appeared to be more dependent upon the individual's personal qualities; such as, a conveyed attitude of acceptance, warmth, understanding, and empathy.

5. The interaction effect due to counselor-student personality similarity and the race of the counselor did not appear to be an important factor influencing the counseling relationship.

6. The interaction effect due to counselor-student personality similarity and the sex of the student did not appear to be an important factor influencing the counseling relationship.

7. The interaction effect due to the sex of the student and the individual counselor did not appear to be an important factor influencing the counseling relationship.

8. There appeared to be some difference of opinion in the students' perception of the counseling relationship as compared to both the black and white counselors' perception of that relationship. Both black and white counselors tend to underestimate the degree of unconditionality shown in the counseling relationship.

9. There appeared to be no important difference in the counseling relationship established with black students by counselors classified by an independent judge as highly responsive counselors, as compared with counselors classified as responsive counselors.

The conclusions are drawn with a full understanding that the limitations of the population size and the statistical techniques employed affect the ability to generalize.

Recommendations

The findings and conclusions of this study suggest the following recommendations:

1. There is need to use male counselors in further research of the counseling relationship with black students.

2. There is need for a duplication of this study, especially with the addition of white students.

3. There is a need for further research of the counseling relationship utilizing a larger population. It is difficult to draw conclusions with a small sample of black students.

4. There is a need to study in greater depth the effects of the individual counselor upon the effectiveness of the counseling relationship. There is a need for further investigation into questions arising out of this study; such as, what enabled some counselors within a race to be perceived by students as significantly more effective in a counseling relationship.

5. There may be a need for further study into counselor-student personality similarity effects upon a counseling relationship. There were too many aspects of the present study to enable sufficient in-depth study of this particular area. Future research centering on counselor-student personality similarity may reveal that this is an important factor influencing effective outcomes of a counseling relationship.

It is hoped that this attempt to analyze some of the underlying causal factors involved in the blockage of communication within a counseling relationship will be utilized to point out that school counselors may be able to deal with any type of client, regardless of the counselor's race. The results of this study may be utilized in education's attempt to facilitate more effective communication between races.

Chapter V has attempted to present a summary, a list of conclusions, and recommendations for this study.

REFERENCES

Anastasi, Anne. Psychological Testing. 3rd ed. New York: The MacMillan Company (1968), pp. 454-455.

Backner, Burton L. "Counseling Black Students: Any Place for Whitey?" Journal of Higher Education, vol. 41 (1970), pp. 630-637.

Barney, Pat O. and Hall, Lurel D. "A Study in Discrimination." Personnel and Guidance Journal, (March, 1966), pp. 707-709.

Barrett-Lennard, G. T. "Dimensions of Therapist Response as Causal Factors in Therapeutic Change." Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, vol. 76, no. 43 (1962), (Whole No. 562).

Banks, William M. "Militant Black Counselors: Riffraff or Vanguard?" Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 50, no. 7 (March, 1972), pp. 575-584.

Bellenger, M. E. "Guidance for the Disaffected." Educational Leadership, vol. 20 (1963), pp. 294-297.

Bender, I. E. and Hastorf, A. H. "On Measuring Generalized Empathic Ability." Journal of Abnormal Psychology, vol. 48 (1953), pp. 503-506.

Berzon, Betty. "The Self-Directed Therapeutic Group: An Evaluation Study." Western Behavioral Science Reports, (series on "The Intensive Group Experience"), no. 1, (1964).

Bolden, James A. "Black Students and the School Counselor." The School Counselor, vol. 17, no. 3 (January, 1970), pp. 205-207.

Boney, Don J.; Dunn, Charleta; and Bass, Thomas. "An Analysis of the Participation of Racially Integrated Guidance Groups of Culturally Different Children in Elementary School." Journal of Negro Education, vol. 40, no. 4 (Fall, 1971), pp. 390-393.

Brown, L. B. "Race as a Factor in Establishing a Casework Relationship." Social Casework, vol. 21 (1950), pp. 96-97.

Burrell, Leon. "Black and White Students' Attitudes Toward White Counselors." Journal of Negro Education, vol. 40 (1971), pp. 48-52.

Calia, V. F. "The Culturally Deprived Client: A Reformulation of the Counselor's Role." Journal of Counseling Psychology, vol. 14 (1966), pp. 100-105.

Cameron, Paul. "Personality Differences Between Typcial Urban Negroes and Whites." *Journal of Negro Education*, vol. 40, no. 1 (Winter, 1971), pp. 66-75.

Carkhuff, Robert R. and Banks, George. "Training as a Preferred Mode of Facilitating Relations Between Races and Generations." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, vol. 17, no. 5 (1970), pp. 413-418.

Carmichael, Stokely and Hamilton, Charles, V. *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America*. New York: Random House, 1967.

Carson, Robert C. and Heine, R. W. "Similarity and Success in Therapeutic Dyads." Journal of Consulting Psychology, vol. 26 (1962), pp. 38-43.

Carson, Robert, C. and Llewellyn, Charles E. Jr. "Similarity in Therapeutic Dyads: A Re-evaluation." *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, vol. 30, no. 5 (1966), p. 458.

Cassel, Russell N. "Counseling the Disadvantaged." *Education*, vol. 9 (November, 1969), pp. 103-108.

Clark, J. W. and Culbert, S. A. "Mutually Therapeutic Perception and Self-Awareness in a T Group." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, vol. 2, no. 1 (1965), pp. 180-194.

Clark, Joanna and Walter, Henrietta. "Counseling the Culturally Deprived: A Survey of High School Counselors' Opinions and Attitudes." *The School Counselor*, vol. 19, no. 3 (January, 1972), pp. 201-209.

Clements, Hubert M., Duncan, Jack A., and Taylor, Wallace, M. "Toward Effective Evaluation of the Culturally Deprived." *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, vol. 47, no. 9 (May, 1969), pp. 891-896.

Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. "Examiner's Manual," Level 4, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. "Technical Report," All levels, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. "Testing Coordinator's Handbook," All levels, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Cothran. T. C. "Negro Conceptions of White People." *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 56 (1951), pp. 458-467.

Cronbach, L. T. "Processes Affecting Scores on 'Understanding' and 'Assumed Similarity'." *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 52 (1955), pp. 177-193.

Daley, Thelma T. "The Counselor Makes a Difference." *The School Counselor*, vol. 19, no. 3 (January, 1972), pp. 147.

Deutsch, M. et al. "Guideline for Testing Minority Group Children." *The Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 29 (1964), pp. 129-145.

Donnan, Hugh H.; Harlan, Grady E.; and Thompson, Seaborn A., "Counselor Personality and Level of Functioning as Perceived by Counselees." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, vol. 16, no. 6 (1969), pp. 482-485.

Fibush, E. "The White and the Negro Client." *Social Casework*, vol. 46 (1965), pp. 271-277.

Fuller, Frances, F. "Influence of Sex of Counselor and of Client on Client Expressions of Feelings." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, vol. 10, no. 1 (1963), pp. 34-40.

Green, Robert Lee. "After School Integration-What? Problems in Social Learning." *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, (March, 1966), pp. 704-710.

Gross, W. F. and DeRidder, L. M. "Significant Movement in Comparatively Short-Term Counseling." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, vol. 13 (1966), pp. 98-99.

Haettenschwiller, Dunstan, L. "Counseling Black College Students in Special Programs." *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, vol. 50, no. 1 (September, 1971), pp. 29-35.

Hecht, Edward. "Guidance Program for a Ghetto School." *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, vol. 48, no. 9 (May, 1970), pp. 731-738.

Heffernon, Andrew and Bruehl, Dieter. "Some Effects of Race of Inexperienced Lay Counselors on Black Junior High School Students." Journal of School Psychology, vol. 9, no. 1 (1971), pp. 35-37.

Hollenbeck, G. P. "Conditions and Outcomes in the Student-Parent Relationship." *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, vol. 29 (1965), pp. 237-241.

Hunt, J. et al. "An Integrated Approach to Research on Therapeutic Counseling with Samples of Results." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, vol. 6 (1959), pp. 46-54.

Jourard, Sidney, M. "Age and Self-Disclosure." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavioral Development*, vol. 7 (1961), pp. 191-197.

Jourard, Sidney, M. "Self-Disclosure." *Mental Hygiene*, vol. 43 (1959), pp. 499-507.

Jourard, Sidney, M. The Transparent Self. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Co. Inc., 1964.

Jourard, S. M. and Lansman, M. J. "Cognition, Cathexis, and the 'Dyadic Effect' in Men's Self-Disclosure Behavior." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavioral Development, vol. 6 (1960), pp. 178-186.

Jourard, S. M. and Lasakow, P. "Some Factor in Self-Disclosure." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, vol. 56 (1958), pp. 91-98.

Jung, C. G. Psychological Types. London: Rutledge and Kegan Paul, 1923.

Kincaid, Marylou. "Identity and Therapy in the Black Community." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 47, no. 9 (May, 1969), pp. 884-890.

Kunce, Joseph, and Anderson, Wayne. "Counselor-Client Similarity and Referral Bias." Journal of Counseling Psychology, vol. 17, no. 2 (1970), pp. 102-106.

Lefkowitz, David M. and Baker, Judith. "Black Youth: A Counseling Experience." The School Counselor, vol. 18, no. 4 (March, 1971), pp. 290-293.

Lewis, Sinclair O. "Racism in Counseling." Counselor Education and Supervision, vol. 9, no. 1 (Fall, 1969), pp. 49-54.

Lichtenstein, Edward. "Personality Similarity and Therapeutic Success: A Failure to Replicate." Journal of Consulting Psychology, vol. 30, no. 3 (1966), p. 282.

Locke, Don W. "Racism Encountered in Counseling." Counselor Education and Supervision, vol. 9, no. 1 (Fall, 1969), pp. 56-60.

Locke, Don W. "Reaction to Lewis on Racism Encountered in Counseling." Counselor Education and Supervision, vol. 9, no. 1 (Fall, 1969), pp. 54-55.

Love, R. B. "Counseling the Disadvantaged Youth." California Teachers' Association Journal, vol. 61 (1965), pp. 632-634.

McClain, Edwin W. "Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire Scores and Success in Counseling." Journal of Counseling Psychology, vol. 15, no. 6 (1968), pp. 492-496.

McGrew, John M. "Counseling the Disadvantaged Child: A Practice in Search of a Rationale." The School Counselor, vol. 18, no. 3 (January, 1971), pp. 165-176.

Mendelsohn, Gerald, A. "Effects of Client Personality and Client-Counselor Similarity on the Duration of Counseling: A Replication and Extension." Journal of Counseling Psychology, vol. 13, no. 2 (1966), pp. 228-234.

Mendelsohn, Gerald A. and Geller, Marvin H. "Effects of Counselor-Client Similarity on the Outcome of Counseling." Journal of Counseling Psychology, vol. 10, no. 1 (1963), pp. 71-77.

Mendelsohn, Gerald, A. and Geller, Marvin H. "Structure of Client Attitudes Toward Counseling and Their Relation to Client-Counselor Similarity." Journal of Consulting Psychology, vol. 29 (1965, no. 1, pp. 63-72.

Mendelsohn, Gerald A. and Kirk, Barbara A. "Personality Differences Between Students Who Do and Do Not Use a Counseling Psychology, vol. 9 (1962), pp. 34-46.

Mills, David, H. and Zytowski, Donald, G. "Helping Relationship: A Structural Analysis." Journal of Counseling Psychology, vol. 14, no. 3 (1967), pp. 193-197.

Myers, Isabel Briggs. Introduction to Type. Swarthmore, Pa. (1970), pp. 6-13.

Myers, Isabel Briggs. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator-Manual. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, (1962).

Nelson, Richard, C.; Nivens, Maryruth, K.; and Smith, Helen, D. "The Individual and Racial Understanding." Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, vol. 4, no. 2 (December, 1969), pp. 142-145.

Phillips, Waldo, B. "Counseling Negro Pupils: An Educational Dilemma." Journal of Negro Education, vol. 29 (1960), p. 504-507.

Phillips, Waldo, B. "Notes from Readers." Harvard Educational Review, vol. 31 (1961), pp. 324-326.

Proctor, Samuel, L. "Reversing the Spiral Toward Futility." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 48, no. 9 (May, 1970), pp. 707-712.

Record, W. "Counseling and Communication." Journal of Negro Education, vol. 30 (1964), pp. 450-454.

Rochester, Dean E. "Sex and Age as Factors Relating to Counselor Attitude Change." Counselor Education and Supervision, vol. 2, no. 3 (March, 1972), pp. 214-218.

Rogers, D. A. "Relationships Between Real Similarity and Assumed Similarity with Favorability Controlled." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, vol. 59 (1959), pp. 431-433.

Rogers, C. R. and Dymond, Rosalind, F. (eds.). Psychotherapy and Personality Change. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Rousseve, Ronald. "Reason and Reality in Counseling the Student-Client Who Is Black." The School Counselor, vol. 17, no. 5 (May, 1970), pp. 337-344.

Russell, R. D. "Black Perceptions of Guidance." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 48, no. 9 (May, 1970), pp. 721-729.

Sager, Clifford J., Brayboy, Thomas, L., and Waxenberg, Barbara R. "Black Patient-White Therapist." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, vol. 42, no. 3 (April, 1972), pp. 415-423.

Schaffe, Henry. The Analysis of Variance. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959.

Simmons, L. C. "Crow Jim: Implications for Social Work." Social Work, vol. 8 (1963), pp. 24-29.

Smith, D. H. "The White Counselor in the Negro Slum School." The School Counselor, vol. 14 (1967), pp. 268-272.

Smith, Paul, M. Jr. "Black Activists for Liberation, Not Guidance." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 49, no. 9 (May, 1971), pp. 721-726.

Smith, Paul, M. Jr. "Counselors for Ghetto Youth." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 47, no. 3 (November, 1968), pp. 279-281.

Smith, Paul, M., Jr. "Get Together Now!" Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 48, no. 9 (May, 1970), pp. 706.

Smith, Paul, M., Jr. "The Role of the Guidance Counselor in the Desegregation Process." Journal of Negro Education, vol. 40, no. 4 (Fall, 1971), pp. 347-351.

Snelbecker, G. E. "Influence of Therapeutic Techniques on College Students' Perceptions of Therapists." Journal of Consulting Psychology, vol. 31, no. 6 (1967), pp. 614-618.

St. Clair, H. "Psychiatric Interviews: Experiences with Negroes." American Journal of Psychiatry, no. 108 (1951), pp. 111-118.

Stricker, L. J. and Ross, J. "Some Correlates of a Jungian Personality Inventory." Psychological Reports, vol. 14 (1964), pp. 623-643.

Testing, Evaluation, and Research Notebook, Department of Child Study and Student Counseling, Columbus Public Schools, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

Tolson, Henrietta. "Counseling the Disadvantaged." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 50, no. 9 (May, 1972), pp. 735-738.

Tosi, Donald, J. "The Counseling Relationship Perceived by the Client Following the Initial Encounter as a Function of Dogmatism Within the Counselor-Client Dyad." Unpublished Dissertation, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio (1968).

Tribble, Ike. "Motivational Counseling: A Black Educational Imperative." Educational Leadership, vol. 28, no. 3 (December, 1970), pp. 297-301.

Van der Verr, F. "The Perception by Clients and by Judges of the Conditions Offered by the Therapist in the Therapy Relationship." Psychiatric Institute Bulletin, no. 1 (1961).

Vontress, C. E. "Counseling Negro Adolescents." The School Counselor, vol. 15, no. 2 (November, 1967), pp. 86-91.

Vontress, Clemmont E. "Counseling Negro Students for College." Journal of Negro Education, vol. 37 (Winter, 1968), pp. 37-44.

Vontress, Clemmont, E. "Cultural Barriers in the Counseling Relationship." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 48, no. 1 (September, 1969), pp. 11-17.

Vontress, Clemmont, E. "Cultural Differences: Implications for Counseling." The Journal of Negro Education, vol. 38 (Summer, 1969), pp. 266-275.

Vontress, Clemmont, E. "Racial Differences: Impediments to Rapport." Journal of Counseling Psychology, vol. 18, no. 1 (1971), pp. 7-13.

Vontress, Clemmont, E. "The Black Militant as a Counselor." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 50, no. 7 (March, 1972), pp. 574-580.

Walker, B. S. and Little, D. F. "Factor Analysis of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory." Journal of Counseling Psychology, vol. 16, no. 6 (1969), pp. 516-521.

Ward, Eric J. "A Gift from the Ghetto." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 48, no. 9 (May, 1970), pp. 753-756.

Warner, Richard, W. Jr. and Hansen, James, C. "Alienated Youth: The Counselor's Task." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 48, no. 6 (February, 1970), pp. 433-448.

Washington, Kenneth, S. "What Counselors Must Know About Black Power." Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 47, no. 3 (November, 1968), pp. 204-208.

Wittmer, Joe. "Effective Counseling of Children of Several American Subcultures." The School Counselor, vol. 19, no. 1 (September, 1971), pp. 49-56.

Appendix A

Letter of Approval

Columbus Public Schools

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
HAROLD H. EIBLING

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES
270 EAST STATE STREET
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215
TELEPHONE 228-3821

DEPARTMENT OF CHILD STUDY AND STUDENT COUNSELING

June 12, 1970

Dr. Herman J. Peters
Professor of Education
Arps Hall
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Dear Dr. Peters:

Mr. Ferrell and I have consulted with the Assistant Superintendent for Administration and his assistant, Mr. Robert Carter, and they have given their approval to conduct the study you discussed with us the afternoon of June 10. We understand that the study will involve the selection of 10 Black counselors and a number of students and that the study will be primarily concerned with the extent to which black students perceive themselves as socially-distant to counselors of racial backgrounds different from their own.

Mr. Ferrell and I will be glad to assist you in the implementation of the study should it be approved and funded. Don't hesitate to call on us at any time if you have questions about setting up the study next fall.

Sincerely,

Keith D. Barnes

Keith D. Barnes, Ph. D.
Supervisor of Guidance Services

C. Ferrell

Clayton E. Ferrell,
Director of Child Study and
Student Counseling

KB/CF/rc

Approved: Mr. C. L. Dumaree, Assistant Superintendent
Administrative Services

Mr. Robert Carter, Director
Administrative Services

Appendix B

Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory -- Form OS-F-64

Code: Date:

Relationship Inventory -- Form OS-F-64

Below are listed a variety of ways that one person may feel or behave in relation to another person.

Please consider each statement with reference to your present relationship with your counselor.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+3 -- Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
+2 -- Yes, I feel that it is true.
+1 -- Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.

-1 -- No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-2 -- No, I feel it is not true.
-3 -- No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

__ 1. She respects me as a person.

__ 2. She wants to understand how I see things.

__ 3. Her interest in me depends on the things I say or do.

__ 4. She is comfortable and at ease in our relationship

__ 5. She feels a true liking for me.

__ 6. She may understand my words but she does not see the way I feel.

__ 7. Whether I am feeling happy or unhappy with myself makes no real difference to the way she feels about me.

__ 8. I feel that she puts on a role or front with me.

__ 9. She is impatient with me.

__10. She nearly always knows exactly what I mean.

__11. Depending on my behavior, she has a better opinion of me than she has at other times.

__12. I feel that she is real and genuine with me.

__13. I feel appreciated by her.

__14. She looks at what I do from her own point of view.

__15. Her feeling toward me doesn't depend on how I feel toward her.

__16. It makes her uneasy when I ask or talk about certain things.

__17. She is indifferent to me.

__18. She usually senses or realizes what I am feeling.

__19. She wants me to be a particular kind of person.

__20. I nearly always feel that what she says expresses exactly what she is feeling and thinking as she says it.

__21. She finds me rather dull and uninteresting.

__22. Her own attitudes toward some of the things I do or say prevent her from understanding me.

__23. I can (or could) be openly critical or appreciative of her without really making her feel any differently about me.

__24. She wants me to think that she likes me or understands me more than she really does.

__25. She cares for me.

__26. Sometimes she thinks that I feel a certain way, because that's the way she feels.

__27. She likes certain things about me, and there are other things she does not like.

__28. She does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.

__29. I feel that she disapproves of me.

__30. She realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it.

__31. Her attitude toward me stays the same: she is not pleased with me sometimes and critical or disappointed at other times.

__32. Sometimes she is not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.

__33. She just tolerates me.

__34. She usually understands the whole of what I mean.

__35. If I show that I am angry with her she becomes hurt or angry with me, too.

__36. She expresses her true impressions and feelings with me.

__37. She is friendly and warm with me.

__38. She just takes no notice of some things that I think or feel.

__39. How much she likes or dislikes me is not altered by anything that I tell her about myself.

__40. At times I sense that she is not aware of what she is really feeling with me.

__41. I feel that she really values me.

__42. She appreciates exactly how the things I experience feel to me.

__43. She approves of some things I do, and plainly disapproves of others.

__44. She is willing to express whatever is actually in her mind with me, including any feelings about herself or about me.

__45. She doesn't like me for myself.

__46. At times she thinks that I feel a lot more strongly about a particular thing than I really do.

__47. Whether I am in good spirits or feeling upset does not make her feel any more or less appreciative of me.

__48. She is openly herself in our relationship.

__49. I seem to irritate and bother her.

__50. She does not realize how sensitive I am about some of the things we discuss.

__51. Whether the ideas and feelings I express are "good" or "bad" seems to make no difference to her feelings toward me.

__52. There are times when I feel that her outward response to me is quite different from the way she feels underneath.

__53. At times she feels contempt for me.

__54. She understands me.

__55. Sometimes I am more worthwhile in her eyes than I am at other times.

__56. I have not felt she tries to hide anything from herself that she feels with me.

__57. She is truly interested in *me*.

__58. Her response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to her.

__59. I don't think that anything I say or do really changes the way she feels toward me.

__60. What she says to me often gives a wrong impression of her whole thought or feeling at the time.

__61. She feels deep affection for me.

__62. When I am hurt or upset she can recognize my feelings exactly, without becoming upset herself.

__63. What other people think of me does (or would, if she knew) affect the ways she feels toward me.

__64. I believe that she has feelings she does not tell me about that are causing difficulty in our relationship.

Appendix C

Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory -- Form OS-G-64

Code: Date:

Relationship Inventory -- Form OS-G-64

Below are listed a variety of ways that a person may find others behaving or feeling toward him (or her).

Please consider each statement with reference to the present relationship between the students you counseled as a whole and yourself.

Mark each statement in the left margin, according to how strongly you feel that it is true, or not true, in this relationship. Please mark every one. Write in +3, +2, +1, or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+3 -- Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
+2 -- Yes, I feel it is true.
+1 -- Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.

-1 -- No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-2 -- No, I feel it is not true.
-3 -- No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

___ 1. They respect me as a person.

___ 2. They want to understand how I see things.

___ 3. Their interest in me depends on the things I say or do.

___ 4. They are comfortable and at ease with me.

___ 5. They feel a true liking for me.

___ 6. They may understand my words but they don't see the way I feel.

___ 7. Whether I am feeling happy or unhappy with myself makes no real difference to the way they feel about me.

___ 8. I feel they put on a role or front with me.

___ 9. They are impatient with me.

___10. They nearly always know exactly what I mean.

___11. Depending on my behavior, they have a better opinion of me sometimes than they do at other times.

___12. I feel that they are real and genuine with me.

68/69

___13. I feel appreciated by them.

___14. They look at what I do from their own point of view.

___15. Their feeling toward me does not depend on how I am feeling toward them.

___16. It makes them uneasy when I ask or talk about certain things.

___17. They are indifferent to me.

___18. They usually sense or realize what I am feeling.

___19. They want me to be a particular kind of person.

___20. I nearly always feel that what they say expresses exactly what they are feeling and thinking at that time.

___21. They find me rather dull and uninteresting.

___22. Their attitudes toward some of the things I do or say prevents them from understanding me.

___23. I can be (or could be) openly critical or appreciative of them without really making them feel any differently about me.

___24. They want me to think that they like me or understand me more than they really do.

___25. They care for me.

___26. Sometimes they think that I feel a certain way, because it's the way they feel.

___27. They like certain things about me, and there are other things they do not like.

___28. They do not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.

___29. I feel that they disapprove of me.

___30. They realize what I mean even when I have difficulty saying it.

___31. Their attitude toward me stays the same: they are not pleased with me sometimes and critical or disappointed at other times.

___32. Sometimes they are not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.

___33. They just tolerate me.

___34. They usually understand the whole of what I mean.

___35. If I show that I am angry with them they become hurt or angry with me, too.

___36. They express their true impressions and feelings with me.

___37. They are friendly and warm with me.

___38. They just take no notice of some things that I think or feel.

___39. How much they like or dislike me is not altered by anything that I tell them about myself.

___40. At times I sense that they are not aware of what they are really feeling.

___41. I feel that they really value me.

___42. They appreciate exactly how the things I experience feel to me.

___43. They approve of some things I do, and plainly disapprove of other things.

___44. They are willing to express whatever they actually have in mind with me, including any feelings about themselves or about me.

___45. They don't like me for myself.

___46. At times they think that I feel a lot more strongly about a particular thing than I really do.

___47. Whether I am in good spirits or feeling upset does not make them feel any more or less appreciative of me.

___48. They are openly themselves with me.

___49. I seem to irritate and bother them.

___50. They do not realize how sensitive I am about some of the things we discuss.

___51. Whether the ideas and feelings I express are "good" or "bad" seems to make no difference to the way they feel toward me.

___52. There are times when I feel that their outward response to me is quite different from the way they feel underneath.

___53. At times they feel contempt for me.

___54. They understand me.

___55. Sometimes I am more worthwhile in their eyes than I am at other times.

___56. I have not felt that they try to hide from themselves anything that they feel with me.

___57. They are truly interested in me.

___58. Their response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to them.

___59. I don't think that anything I say or do actually changes the way they feel toward me.

___60. What they say to me often gives a wrong impression of their whole thought or feeling at the time.

Appendix D

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (F)

MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR (F)

READ THESE DIRECTIONS FIRST:

This is a test to show which sides of your personality you have developed the most. The answer you choose to any question is neither "right" nor "wrong." It simply helps to point out what type of person you are, and therefore where your special strengths lie and what kinds of work you may like to do.

For each question, choose the answer which comes closest to how you usually feel or act.

Mark your choice on the separate answer sheet, as shown in the samples below:

Sample Question	Sample Answer Sheet
167. Are your interests	167. A B
(A) few and lasting	( ) ( )
(B) varied	

If your interests are varied, you would mark answer "B" as it is marked above. If they are few and lasting, you would mark "A." Be sure that each mark is black and completely fills the answer space. If you change an answer, be sure that all previous marks are completely erased. Incomplete erasures may be read as intended answers.

If you find a question where you cannot choose, do not mark both answers. Just skip the question and go on.

PART I

1. Does following a schedule
   (A) appeal to you
   (B) cramp you

2. Do you usually get on better with
   (A) imaginative people
   (B) realistic people

3. If strangers are staring at you in a crowd, do you
   (A) often become aware of it
   (B) seldom notice it

4. Are you more careful about
   - (A) people's feelings
   - (B) their rights

5. Are you
   - (A) inclined to enjoy deciding things
   - (B) just as glad to have circumstances decide a matter for you

6. As a guest, do you more enjoy
   - (A) joining in the talk of the group
   - (B) talking separately with people you know well

7. When you have more knowledge or skill in something than the people around you, is it more satisfying
   - (A) to guard your superior knowledge
   - (B) to share it with those who want to learn

8. When you have done all you can to remedy a troublesome situation, are you
   - (A) able to stop worrying about it
   - (B) still more or less haunted by it

9. If you were asked on a Saturday morning what you were going to do that day, would you
   - (A) be able to tell pretty well
   - (B) list twice as many things to do as any day can hold
   - (C) have to wait and see

10. Do you think on the whole that
    - (A) children have the best of it
    - (B) life is more interesting for grown-ups

11. In doing something which many other people do, does it appeal more to you
    - (A) to do it in the accepted way
    - (B) to invent a way of your own

12. When you were small, did you
    - (A) feel sure of your parents' love and devotion to you
    - (B) feel that they admired and approved of some other child more than they did of you

13. Do you
    - (A) rather prefer to do things at the last minute
    - (B) find it hard on the nerves

14. If a breakdown or mix-up halted a job on which you and a lot of others were working, would your impulse be
    - (A) to enjoy the breathing spell
    - (B) to look for some part of the work where you could still make progress
    - (C) to join the "trouble-shooters" who were wrestling with the difficulty.

15. Do you
    (A) show your feelings freely as you go along
    (B) keep them to yourself

16. When you have decided upon a course of action, do you
    (A) reconsider it if unforeseen disadvantages are pointed out to you
    (B) usually put it through to a finish, however it may inconvenience yourself and others

17. In reading for pleasure, do you
    (A) enjoy odd or original ways of saying things
    (B) wish writers would say exactly what they mean

18. In any of the ordinary emergencies of life (not matters of life or death), do you prefer
    (A) to take orders and be helpful
    (B) to give orders and be responsible

19. At parties, do you
    (A) sometimes get bored
    (B) always have fun

20. Is it harder for you to adapt to
    (A) routine
    (B) constant change

21. Would you be more willing to take on a heavy load of extra work for the sake of
    (A) additional comforts and luxuries
    (B) the chance of becoming famous through your work

22. Are the things you plan to undertake
    (A) almost always things you can finish
    (B) frequently things that prove too difficult to carry through

23. Are you more attracted
    (A) to a person with a quick and brilliant mind
    (B) to a practical person with a lot of horse sense

24. Do you find people in general
    (A) slow to appreciate and accept ideas not their own
    (B) reasonably open-minded

25. When you have to meet strangers, do you find it
    (A) pleasant, or at least easy
    (B) something that takes a good deal of effort

26. Are you inclined
    (A) to value sentiment above logic
    (B) to value logic above sentiment

27. Do you like
    (A) to arrange your dates and parties some distance ahead
    (B) to be free to do whatever looks like fun at the time

28. In making plans which concern other people, do you prefer
    (A) to take them into your confidence
    (B) to keep them in the dark till the last possible moment

29. Which of these two is the higher compliment
    (A) he is a person of real feeling
    (B) he is consistently reasonable

30. When you have to make up your mind about something, do you like to
    (A) do it right away
    (B) postpone the decision as long as you reasonably can

31. When you run into an unexpected difficulty in something your are doing, do you feel it to be
    (A) a piece of bad luck
    (B) a nuisance
    (C) all in the day's work

32. Do you almost always
    (A) enjoy the present moment and make the most of it
    (B) feel that something just ahead is more important

33. Are you
    (A) easy to get to know
    (B) hard to get to know

34. With most of the people you know, do you
    (A) feel that they mean what they say
    (B) feel you must watch for a hidden meaning

35. When you start a big project that is due in a week, do you
    (A) take time to list the separate things to be done and the order of doing them
    (B) plunge in

36. In solving a personal problem, do you
    (A) feel more confident about it if you have asked other people's advice
    (B) feel that nobody else is in as good a position to judge as you are

37. Do you admire more the person who is
    (A) conventional enough never to make himself conspicuous
    (B) too original and individual to care whether he is conspicuous or not

38. Which mistake would be more natural for you
    (A) to drift from one thing to another all your life
    (B) to stay in a rut that didn't suit you

39. When you run across people who are mistaken in their beliefs, do you feel that
    (A) it is your duty to set them right
    (B) it is their privilege to be wrong

40. When an attractive chance for leadership comes to you do you
    (A) accept it if it is something you can really swing
    (B) sometimes let it slip because you are too modest about your own abilities
    (C) or doesn't leadership ever attract you

41. In your crowd, are you
    (A) one of the last to hear what is going on
    (B) full of new about everybody

42. Are you at your best
    (A) when dealing with the unexpected
    (B) when following a carefully worked-out plan

43. Does the importance of doing well on a test make it generally
    (A) easier for you to concentrate and do your best
    (B) harder for you to concentrate and do yourself justice

44. In your free hours do you
    (A) very much enjoy stopping somewhere for refreshments
    (B) usually want to use the time and money another way

45. At the time in your life when things piled up on you the worst, did you find
    (A) that you had got into an impossible situation
    (B) that by doing only the necessary things you could work your way out

46. Do most of the people you know
    (A) take their fair share of praise and blame
    (B) grab all the credit they can but shift any blame on to someone else

47. When you are in an embarrassing spot, do you usually
    (A) change the subject
    (B) turn it into a joke
    (C) days later, think of what you should have said

48. Are such emotional "ups and downs" as you may feel
    (A) very marked
    (B) rather moderate

49. Do you think that having a daily routine is
    - (A) a comfortable way of getting things done
    - (B) painful even when necessary

50. Are you naturally
    - (A) a "good mixer"
    - (B) rather quiet and reserved in company

51. In your early childhood (at six or eight), did you
    - (A) feel your parents were very wise people who should be obeyed
    - (B) find their authority irksome and escape it when possible

52. When you have a suggestion that ought to be made at a meeting, do you
    - (A) stand up and make it as a matter of course
    - (B) hesitate to do so

53. Do you get more annoyed at
    - (A) fancy theories
    - (B) people who don't like theories

54. When helping in a group undertaking, are you more often struck by
    - (A) the inspiring quality of shoulder to shoulder cooperation
    - (B) the annoying inefficiency of loosely organized group work
    - (C) or don't you get involved in group undertakings

55. When you go somewhere for the day, would you rather
    - (A) plan what you will do and when
    - (B) just go

56. Are the things you worry about
    - (A) often really not worth it
    - (B) always more or less serious

57. In making an important decision on a given set of facts, do you
    - (A) find you can trust your feeling judgments
    - (B) need to set feeling aside and rely on analysis and cold logic

58. In the matter of friends, do you tend to seek
    - (A) deep friendship with a very few people
    - (B) broad friendship with many different people

59. Do you think your friends
    - (A) feel you are open to suggestions
    - (B) know better than to try to talk to you out of anything you've decided to do

These pages were

~~THIS PAGE WAS~~ MISSING FROM THE DOCUMENT THAT WAS SUBMITTED TO ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE.

pages 81-86

If his perception is underdeveloped or not allowed to influence his judgment, he will jump to conclusions. For lack of first-hand knowledge of a person or situation, he will act upon assumptions and, while he means well, his actions may go wide of the mark. As a trainee, he is apt to do things as he judges they "should" be done, instead of taking time to find out how the organization works or what is wanted. When faced with a disagreeable fact or a criticism that hurts, he may be unable to admit its truth and may seek somehow to escape the issue.

ESFJ With sensing as auxiliary	ENFJ With intuition as auxiliary
Sees the realities. Practical, realistic, matter-of-fact, concerned with here and now. Interested in material possessions and details of direct experience. Likes to base plans, decisions, etc., upon known facts. Usually adapts excellently to routine.	Sees the possibilities. Has more curiosity for new ideas as such, more insight, vision and concern for future possibilities. More interested in books and more tolerant of theory. Likely to have a gift of expression, but may like to use it in speaking to audiences rather than in writing.

Introverted Feeling Types - ISFP and INFP

An introverted feeling type has a much wealth of feeling as an extraverted feeling type, but uses it differently. He cares more deeply about fewer things. He has his warm side inside (like a fur-lined coat). It is quite as warm but not as obvious; it may hardly show until you get past his reserve. He has, too, a great faithfullness to duty and obligations. He chooses his final values without reference to the judgment of outsiders, and sticks to them with passionate conviction. He finds these inner loyalties and ideals hard to talk about, but they govern his life.

His outer personality is mostly due to his auxiliary process, either S or N, and so is perceptive. He is tolerant, open-minded, understanding, flexible, and adaptable (though when one of his inner loyalties is threatened he will not give an inch). Except for his work's sake, he has little wish to impress or dominate. The contacts he prizes are with people who understand his values and the goals he is working toward.

He is twice as good when working at a job he believes in, since his feeling for it puts added energy behind his efforts. He wants his work to contribute to something that matters to him, perhaps to human understanding or happiness or health, or perhaps to the perfecting of some product or undertaking. He wants to have a purpose beyond his paycheck, no matter how big the check. He is a perfectionist wherever his feeling is engaged, and is usually happiest at some individual work involving personal values. With high ability, he may be good in literature, art, science, or psychology.

This type's problem is that he may feel so marked a contrast between inner ideal and outer reality as to burden him with a sense of inadequacy, even when he is being quite as effective as the other types. If he finds no channel of expression for his ideals, they make him too sensitive and vulnerable, with dwindling confidence in life and in himself. If he does find active expression for his ideals, they may give him a high degree of self-confident drive, especially if he has intuition to help him solve whatever difficulties he encounters.

If his perceptive process is undeveloped, he will have so little sense of reality that he will aspire to the impossible and achieve frustratingly little.

ISFP With sensing as auxiliary	INFP With intuition as auxiliary
Sees the realities. Mildly resembles an extraverted sensing type, especially in seeing the needs of the moment and adapting to them. Loves nature and animals. Consistently underestimates and understates himself. Works well at jobs requiring devotion.	Sees the possibilities. Mildly resembles an extraverted intuitive, particularly in liking to concentrate on a project and disliking all details not relevant to any deep interest. Marked by insight and long-range vision, curious about new ideas, interested in books and language. Likely to have a gift of expression, especially in writing. Ingenious and persuasive on the subject of his enthusiasms, which are quiet but deep-rooted.

Extraverted Sensing Types - ESTP and ESFP

This combination makes the adaptable realist, who good-naturedly accepts and uses the facts around him, whatever they are. He knows what they are, since he notices and remembers more than any other type. He knows what goes on, who wants what, who does not, and usually why. And he does not fight those facts. These is a sort of effortless economy in the way he goes at a situation, never uselessly bucking the line.

Often he can get other people to adapt, too. Being a perceptive type, he looks for the satisfying solution, instead of trying to impose any "should" or "must" of his own, and people generally like him well enough to consider any compromise that he thinks "might work." He is unprejudiced, open-minded, and usually patient, easygoing, and tolerant of everyone (including himself). He enjoys life. He does not get wrought up. Thus he may be very good at easing a tense situation and pulling conflicting factions together.

His expert sensing may show itself (a) in a gift for machinery and the running of it, or the handling of tools and materials for craft or artistic purposes, or in the recognition of quality, line, color, texture, or detail; (b) in a capacity for exact facts, even when separate and unrelated, and the ability to absorb, remember, and apply great numbers of them, like the boy who remembers all the batting averages; (c) in a continuous awareness, an ability to see the need of the moment and turn easily to meet it, as a crack athlete will in a game.

Being a realist, he gets far more from first-hand experience than from books, is more effective on the job than on written tests, and is doubly effective when hs is on familiar ground. Seeing the value of new ideas, theories, and possibilities may well come a bit hard, because intuition is his least developed process.

If his judgment is not sufficiently developed to give him any character or stick-to-it-iveness, he may adapt mainly to his own love of a good time, and be lazy, unstable, generally shallow -- a "grasshopper" personality.

ESTP With thinking as auxiliary	ESFP With feeling as auxiliary
Has more grasp of underlying principles, and finds it easier to master the mathematical or theoretical side of things. Especially apt to be interested in machinery. More willing to crack down when the situation really calls for it.	Has more interest in people, and more tact and sympathy with their feelings. Especially easy in handling human contacts. Possibly too easy in matters of discipline. More likely to possess artistic taste and judgment.

Introverted Sensing Types - ISTJ and ISFJ

This combination makes the super-dependable. He has a complete, realistic, practical respect for the facts. He absorbs, remembers, and uses an immense number of them. He likes everything put on a factual basis, clearly stated, and not too unfamiliar or complex. Only when you know him very well do you discover that behind his outer calm he is looking at the facts from an intensely individual angle, often a very droll one. His private reaction, the way a thing will strike him, is quite unpredictable, but what he actually does about it will be sound and sensible.

His outer personality is judging, being mainly derived from his auxiliary process, either T or F. Therefore, in addition to his basic realism he has the stability of a judging type. He is the most thorough of all the types, painstaking, systematic, hard-working, and patient with detail and routine. His extreme perseverence tends to stabilize everything with which he is connected. He does not enter into things impulsively, but once in, he is very hard to distract, discourage, or stop. He does not quit unless experience convinces him he is wrong.

As an administrator, his practical judgment and memory for detail make him conservative, consistent, able to cite cases to support his evaluations of men, methods, etc. He is an obvious choice for the responsibilities of maintenance; if necessary, he will do jobs himself rather than leave them undone. He will go to any amount of trouble if he "can see the need of it," but he does hate to be saddled with a policy that "does not make sense."

It is hard for him to see any sense in needs that differ widely from his own. He is likely to dismiss them offhand as nonessentials. But in a specific case, where he sees something mattering a lot to somebody right before his eyes, he may come to sympathize pretty generously with the desire while still holding it unaccountable.

If his judgment is not developed, he may stop with his inward reaction to facts and not get around to dealing with them at all, which will make him silent, ineffective, and almost impossible to understand.

ISTJ With thinking as auxiliary	ISFJ With feeling as auxiliary
Mildly resembles an extraverted thinking type. Emphasizes analysis, logic, and decisiveness. As an executive he may have some difficulties with people unless he takes extra pains to understand and appreciate.	Mildly resembles an extraverted feeling type. Emphasizes loyalty and consideration and the common welfare. He has more tact and sympathy, more interest in people and concern for their feelings. Likely to have artistic tast and judgment.

Estraverted Intuitive Types - ENTP and ENFP

The extraverted intuitive is the enthusiastic innovator. He is always seeing new possibilities -- new ways of doing things, or quite new and fascinating things that might be done -- and he goes all out in pursuit of them. He has a lot of imagination and initiative for originating projects, and a lot of impulsive energy for carrying them out. He is wholly confident of the worth of his inspirations, tireless with the problems involved, and ingenious with the difficulties. He gets so interested in the current project that he thinks of little else.

He gets other people interested too. Being a perceptive type, he aims to understand people rather than to judge them; often, by putting his mind to it, he achieves an uncanny knowledge of what makes them tick, and uses this to win support for his project. He adapts to other people in the way he presents his objective, but never to the point of giving it up. His faith in his intuition makes him too independent and individualistic to be a conformist, but he keeps a lively circle of contacts through his versatility and his easy interest in almost everything.

In his quieter moments, his auxiliary gives him some balancing introversion and adds depth to the insights supplied by his intuition. At its best, his insight, tempered by judgment, may amount to wisdom.

His trouble is that he hates uninspired routine and finds it remarkably hard to apply himself to humdrum detail unconnected with any major interest. Worse yet, even his projects begin to seem routine and lose their attraction as soon as he has solved the problems and reached plain sailing. He may discipline himself to carry through, but he is happiest and most effective in jobs that permit one project after another, with somebody else taking over as soon as the situation is well in hand.

If his judgment and self-discipline are undeveloped, he will immerse himself in ill-chosen projects, fail to finish them, and squander his inspirations, abilities, and energies in irrelevant and half-done jobs. At his worst, he will be unstable, undependable, fickle, and easily discouraged.

ENTP With thinking as auxiliary	ENFP With feeling as auxiliary
More independent, more analytical and critical of his inspirations, more impersonal in his relations to people, more apt to consider their effect on his project rather than their feelings. May be an inventor, scientist, trouble-shooter, promoter, or almost anything that it interests him to be.	More enthusiastic, more concerned with people and skillful in handling them. Has remarkable insight into their possibilities and interest in their development. May be inspired and inspiring teacher, scientist, artist, advertising man, salesman, or almost anything that it interests him to be.

Introverted Intuitive Types - INTJ and INFJ

The introverted intuitive is the outstanding innovator in the field of ideas, principles, and systems of thought. He trusts his own intuitive insight as to the true relationships and meanings of things, regardless of established authority or popularly accepted beliefs. His faith in his inner vision of the possibilities is such that he can remove mountains -- and often does. In the process he may drive others, or oppose them, as hard as his own inspirations drive him. Problems only stimulate him; the impossible takes a little longer but not much.

His outer personality is judging, being mainly due to his auxiliary, either T or F. Thus he backs up his original insight with the determination, perseverance, and enduring purpose of a judging type. He wants his ideas worked out in practice, applied, and accepted, and spends any time and effort necessary to that end.

The danger for the type arises from his single-minded concentration. He sees his goal so clearly that he may miss other things that he ought to see even though they conflict with that goal: the rights, interests, feelings, and points of view of other people; or facts, conditions, and counter forces that do exist and must be reckoned with. He should talk over his plans with an extraverted sensing type and really listen to him.

He is outstandingly effective in scientific research and engineering design where his boldly ingenious ideas have to meet and fit reality. He always needs some such reality-check, but the very boldness of his ideas may be of immense value in any field and should not be smothered in a routine job full of details.

If his judgment is undeveloped, he cannot criticize his own inner vision, and he tends to reject judgments from outside without really hearing them. As a result, he cannot shape his inspirations into effective action, and may appear only as a visionary or crank.

INTJ

With thinking as auxiliary

Most individualistic and most independent of all the types.

Resembles extraverted thinker, both in his organizing ability and in the danger of ignoring other people's feelings and views.

Needs to make a real effort to understand and appreciate.

Likely to be an effective, relentless reorganizer. Can be an efficient executive rich in ideas.

INFJ

With feeling as auxiliary

Less obviously individualistic, more apt to win cooperation than to demand it.

Somewhat resembles extraverted feeling type, both in sympathetic handling of people and in the danger of ignoring harsh and uncongenial facts.

May apply his ingenuity to problems of human welfare, on his own and in his own way.

Can be a good executive, especially where affairs can be conducted on a personal level.

Appendix F

Tables 3 through 24 - "F" Test Summaries and Mean Score Summaries

Table III. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Pre-Scores

Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for U-Statistic	U-Statistic	Degree of Freedom for F-Statistic	F-Statistic	Significant at 0.01 Level
1. No difference due to race of counselor	4, 1,27	0.931050	4,24	0.444335	NO
2. No difference due to sex of students	4, 1,27	0.932120	4,24	.436936	NO
3. No difference due to individual counselors	4,17,27	0.076969	68,97	1.308696	NO
4. No difference due to individual white counselors	4, 8,27	0.208343	32,90	1.492627	NO
5. No difference due to individual black counselors	4, 9,27	0.236273	36,92	1.195896	NO
6. No difference due to counselor-student personality similarity	4, 2,27	0.747560	8,48	0.939502	NO
7. No interaction due to counselor-student personality similarity and race of the counselor	4, 2,27	0.780563	8,48	0.791211	NO
8. No interaction due to counselor-student personality similarity and sex of the student	4, 2,27	0.733586	8,48	1.005283	NO
9. No interaction due to the sex of the student and individual counselor	4,17,27	0.117576	68,97	1.029523	NO

Table IV. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for each Component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Pre-Scores

Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for F Statistic	F Statistic for Level of Regard Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Empathy Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Unconditionality Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Congruence Score	Significant at 0.01 Level
1. No difference due to race of counselor	1,27	0.129	No	0.405	No	0.346	No	0.899	No
2. No difference due to sex of student	1,27	0.266	No	0.463	No	0.781	No	0.609	No
3. No difference due to individual counselors	17,27	1.774	No	1.117	No	2.317	No	1.612	No
4. No difference due to individual white counselors	8,27	1.683	No	0.954	No	2.720	No	1.664	No
5. No difference due to individual black counselors	9,27	1.850	No	1.258	No	2.043	No	1.561	No
6. No difference due to counselor-student personality similarity	2,27	0.453	No	0.075	No	2.713	No	0.328	No
7. No interaction due to counselor-student personality similarity and race of the counselor	2,27	1.113	No	2.657	No	0.903	No	0.164	No
8. No interaction due to counselor-student personality similarity and sex of the student	2,27	1.095	No	1.708	No	2.724	No	1.623	No
9. No interaction due to the sex of the student and individual counselor	17,27	1.628	No	0.932	No	1.441	No	1.372	No

Table V. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores

Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for U-Statistic	U-Statistic	Degree of Freedom for F-Statistic	F-Statistic	Significant at 0.05 Level	Significant at 0.01 Level
1. No difference due to race of counselor	4, 1,23	0.805177	4,20	.209812	No	No
2. No difference due to sex of students	4, 1,23	0.805868	4,20	1.204487	No	No
3. No difference due to individual counselors	4,17,23	0.029542	68,81	1.727070	Yes	Yes
4. No difference due to individual white counselors	4, 8,23	0.120283	32,75	0.827002	Yes	No
5. No difference due to individual black counselors	4, 9,23	0.101243	36,77	1.794747	Yes	No
6. No difference due to counselor-student personality similarity	4, 2,23	0.639259	8,40	1.253619	No	No
7. No interaction due to counselor-student personality similarity and race of the counselor	4, 2,23	0.580507	8,40	1.562454	No	No
8. No interaction due to counselor-student personality similarity and sex of the student	4, 2,23	0.788349	8,40	0.631326	No	No
9. No interaction due to the sex of the student and individual counselor	4,17,23	0.054847	68,81	1.301815	No	No

Table VI. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for each Component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores

Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for F Statistic	F Statistic for Level of Regard Score	Significant at 0.05 Level	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Empathy Score	Significant at 0.05 Level	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Unconditionality Score	Significant at 0.05 Level	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Congruence Score	Significant at 0.05 Level	Significant at 0.01 Level
1. No difference due to race of counselor	1,23	3.006	No	No	2.198	No	No	3.218	No	No	2.561	No	No
2. No difference due to sex of student	4,20	1.910	No	No	0.454	No	No	1.372	No	No	1.278	No	No
3. No difference due to individual counselors	17,23	2.368	Yes	No	1.392	No	No	2.503	Yes	No	1.906	No	No
4. No difference due to individual white counselors	8,23	2.598	Yes	No	1.078	No	No	1.785	No	No	1.612	No	No
5. No difference due to individual black counselors	9,23	2.130	No	No	1.688	No	No	3.197	Yes	No	2.164	No	No
6. No difference due to counselor-student personality similarity	2,23	1.150	No	No	1.471	No	No	3.211	No	No	1.286	No	No
7. No interaction due to counselor-student personality similarity and race of the counselor	2,23	1.409	No	No	0.038	No	No	1.008	No	No	0.163	No	No
8. No interaction due to counselor-student personality similarity and sex of the student	2,23	0.376	No	No	0.840	No	No	0.264	No	No	0.502	No	No
9. No interaction due to the sex of the student and individual counselor	17,23	0.443	No	No	1.202	No	No	0.930	No	No	1.556	No	No

Table VII. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Pre Scores

Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for U-Statistic	U-Statistic	Degree of Freedom for F-Statistic	F-Statistic	Significant at 0.01 Level
1. No difference due to race of counselor	4, 1,23	0.710230	4,20	2.039973	No
2. No difference due to sex of students	4, 1,23	0.723314	4,20	1.912626	No
3. No difference due to individual counselors	4,17,23	0.049077	68,81	1.373357	No
4. No difference due to individual white counselors	4, 8,23	0.239815	32,75	1.113402	No
5. No difference due to individual black counselors	4, 9,23	0.130993	36,77	1.533997	No
6. No difference due to counselor-student personality similarity	4, 2,23	0.804704	8,40	0.573807	No
7. No interaction due to counselor-student personality similarity and race of the counselor	4, 2,23	0.420248	8,40	2.712889	No
8. No interaction due to counselor-student personality similarity and sex of the student	4, 2,23	0.595290	8,40	1.480455	No
9. No interaction due to the sex of the student and individual counselor	4,17,23	0.065939	68,81	1.187643	No

Table VIII. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance for each Component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Pre Scores

Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for F Statistic	F Statistic for Level of Regard Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Empathy Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Unconditionality Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Congruence Score	Significant at 0.01 Level
1. No difference due to race of counselor	1,23	3.600	No	4.004	No	2.881	No	6.912	No
2. No difference due to sex of student	1,23	8.073	Yes	4.184	No	0.555	No	6.573	No
3. No difference due to individual counselors	17,23	1.552	No	1.446	No	1.771	No	1.294	No
4. No difference due to individual white counselors	8,23	0.538	No	0.646	No	2.386	No	0.647	No
5. No difference due to individual black counselors	9,23	2.448	No	2.192	No	1.198	No	1.869	No
6. No difference due to counselor-student personality similarity	2,23	0.564	No	1.995	No	0.875	No	0.840	No
7. No interaction due to counselor-student personality similarity and race of the counselor	2,23	0.710	No	3.937	No	4.202	No	3.117	No
8. No interaction due to counselor-student personality similarity and sex of the student	2,23	2.818	No	1.592	No	1.648	No	4.369	Yes
9. No interaction due to sex of the student and individual counselor	17,23	0.963	No	0.915	No	2.505	No	1.611	No

Table IX. Mean Scores from Students' Rating of the Counseling Relationship due to the Race of the Counselor

Testing	Race of Counselor	Level of Regard	Empathy	Unconditionality	Congruence
Pre	White	119.417	111.111	102.667	114.611
Pre	Black	124.583	116.861	105.583	123.028
Post	White	123.800	115.143	108.371	121.229
Post	Black	119.636	112.485	104.515	116.606
*Post-Pre	White	3.800	3.029	5.457	5.771
*Post-Pre	Black	-4.906	-4.094	-2.000	-6.906

*Note-White Counselors' rating increased while Black Counselors' decreased

Table X. Mean Scores from Students' Rating of the Counseling Relationship due to the Sex of the Students

Testing	Sex of Students	Level of Regard	Empathy	Unconditionality	Congruence
Pre	Male	121.583	112.861	102.861	118.139
Pre	Female	122.417	115.111	105.389	119.500
Post	Male	119.371	110.886	104.543	117.743
Post	Female	124.333	117.000	108.576	120.303
Post-Pre	Male	-2.912	-3.118	0.912	-1.265
Post-Pre	Female	2.273	2.455	2.909	0.727

Table XI. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Pre-Scores

Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for U-Statistic	U-Statistic	Degree of Freedom for F-Statistic	F-Statistic	Significant at 0.01 Level
1. No difference due to race of counselor	4, 1,30	0.933672	4, 27	0.47920	No
2. No difference due to sex of student	4, 1,30	0.854760	4, 27	1.146956	No
3. No difference due to individual counselors	4,16,30	0.154073	64,108	1.033283	No
4. No difference due to individual white counselors	4, 7,30	0.403619	28, 99	1.009332	No
5. No difference due to individual black counselors	4, 9,30	0.323291	36,103	1.005310	No

Table XII. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for each Component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Pre-Scores

Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for F Statistic	F Statistic for Level of Regard Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Empathy Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Unconditionality Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Congruence Score	Significant at 0.01 Level
1. No difference due to race of counselor	1,30	0.185	No	0.662	No	0.811	No	0.849	No
2. No difference due to sex of student	1,30	0.317	No	0.229	No	0.687	No	0.0103	No
3. No difference due to individual counselors	16,30	1.032	No	0.605	No	1.389	No	0.560	No
4. No difference due to individual white counselors	7,30	0.898	No	0.376	No	1.390	No	0.955	No
5. No difference due to individual black counselors	9,30	1.196	No	0.845	No	1.250	No	1.116	No

Table XIII. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores

Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for U-Statistic	U-Statistic	Degree of Freedom for F-Statistic	F-Statistic	Significant at 0.01 Level
1. No difference due to race of counselor	4, 1,27	0.934083	4,24	0.423413	No
2. No difference due to sex of student	4, 1,27	0.868868	4,24	0.905540	No
3. No difference due to individual counselor	4,16,27	0.081480	64,96	1.349361	No
4. No difference due to individual white counselor	4, 7,27	0.256061	28,88	1.442270	No
5. No difference due to individual black counselor	4, 9,27	0.222105	36,92	1.258166	No

Table XIV. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for each Component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores

Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for F Statistic	F Statistic for Level of Regard Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Empathy Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Unconditionality Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Congruence Score	Significant at 0.01 Level
1. No difference due to race of counselor	1,27	0.525	No	0.055	No	0.687	No	0.862	No
2. No difference due to sex of student	1,27	0.693	No	0.083	No	1.421	No	0.533	No
3. No difference due to individual counselors	16,27	1.056	No	0.965	No	1.677	No	1.077	No
4. No difference due to individual white counselors	7,27	1.342	No	3.741	No	1.422	No	1.153	No
5. No difference due to individual black counselors	9,27	1.139	No	1.475	No	1.932	No	1.313	No

Table XV. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Pre Scores

Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for U-Statistic	U-Statistic	Degree of Freedom for F-Statistic	F-Statistic	Significant at 0.01 Level
1. No difference due to race of counselor	4, 1,27	0.828840	11,24	1.239035	No
2. No difference due to sex of student	4, 1,27	0.964187	4,24	0.222860	No
3. No difference due to individual counselor	4,16,27	0.118639	64,96	1.088274	No
4. No difference due to individual white counselor	4, 7,27	0.490060	28,88	0.687106	No
5. No difference due to individual black counselor	4, 9,27	0.215423	36,92	1.289304	No

Table XVI. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Covariance for each Component of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Pre Scores

Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for F Statistic	F Statistic for Level of Regard Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Empathy Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Unconditionality Score	Significant at 0.01 Level	F Statistic for Congruence Score	Significant at 0.01 Level
1. No difference due to race of counselor	1,27	0.998	No	0.719	No	2.882	No	3.162	No
2. No difference due to sex of student	1,27	0.166	No	0.009	No	0.106	No	0.044	No
3. No difference due to individual counselors	16,27	0.798	No	1.116	No	0.850	No	0.821	No
4. No difference due to individual white counselors	7,27	0.091	No	0.405	No	1.055	No	0.413	No
5. No difference due to individual black counselors	9,27	1.245	No	1.622	No	0.071	No	1.036	No

Table XVII. Multivariate Test of Significance Using Wilks Lambda Criterion Test of Roots for Differences in Rating of the Counseling Relationship Between the Counselors' Rating and the Students' Rating Utilizing Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores

F	Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for Error	P less than	R
8.253	4	15	0.01	0.829

Variables	F(1,18)	P less than
Level of Regard	1.826	0.193
Empathy	2.472	0.133
Unconditionality	13.515	0.002
Congruence	0.430	0.520

Table XVIII. Mean Scores of the Difference in Rating of the Counseling Relationship Between the Counselors' Rating and the Students' Rating

Testing	Level of Regard	Empathy	Unconditionality	Congruence
*Post	-3.127	+4.136	+8.733	+2.267

*(-) indicates the counselors overestimated the component of the counseling relationship with students

*(+) indicates the counselors underestimated the component of the counseling relationship with students

Table XIX. Multivariate Test of Significance Using Wilks Lambda Criterion Test of Roots for Differences in Rating of the Counseling Relationship Between the White Counselors' Rating and the Students' Rating Utilizing the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores

F	Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for Error	P less than	R
2.376	4	5	0.184	0.810

Variables	F(1,8)	P less than
Level of Regard	0.000	0.984
Empathy	1.683	0.231
Unconditionality	6.456	0.035
Congruence	1.508	0.254

Table XX. Multivariate Test of Significance Using Wilks Lambda Criterion Test of Roots for Differences in Rating of the Counseling Relationship Between the Black Counselors' Rating and the Students' Rating Utilizing the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores

F	Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for Error	P less than	R
4.915	4	6	0.042	0.875

Variables	F(1,9)	P less than
Level of Regard	4.043	0.075
Empathy	0.736	0.413
Unconditionality	6.379	0.032
Congruence	0.066	0.804

Table XXI. Mean Scores of the Difference in Rating of the Counseling Relationship Between the Counselors' Rating and the Students' Rating

Testing	Race of Counselors	Level of Regard	Empathy	Unconditionality	Congruence
*Post	White	-0.074	+5.453	+9.519	+6.139
*Post	Black	-5.875	+2.950	+8.025	-1.217

*(-) indicates the counselors' overestimated the component of the counseling relationship with students

*(+) indicates the counselors' underestimated the component of the counseling relationship with students

Table XXII. Multivariate Test of Significance Using Wilks Lambda Criterion Test of Roots for Differences of the Counseling Relationship with Black Students Due to the Counselors' Classification Utilizing Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post-Scores

F	Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for Error	P less than	R
0.985	4	14	0.447	0.469

Variables	F(1,17)	P less than
Level of Regard	1.815	0.196
Empathy	3.972	0.063
Unconditionality	2.671	0.121
Congruence	3.623	0.074

Table XXIII. Multivariate Test of Significance Using Wilks Lambda Criterion Test of Roots for Differences in the Counseling Relationship with a Black Student Due to Counselors' Classification Utilizing Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Post- Pre-Scores

F	Degree of Freedom for Hypothesis	Degree of Freedom for Error	P less than	R
2.909	4	14	0.061	0.674

Variables	F(1,17)	P less than
Level of Regard	2.713	0.118
Empathy	0.058	0.812
Unconditionality	0.000	0.996
Congruence	0.924	0.350

Table XXIV. Mean Scores of the Difference in Rating of the Counseling Relationship due to Counselor Classification

Testing	Counselor Classification	Level of Regard	Empathy	Unconditionality	Congruence
Post	Highly Responsive	124.102	117.056	108.842	122.582
Post	Responsive	118.666	110.008	103.434	114.984
Post-Pre	Highly Responsive	-4.796	-0.990	1.259	-3.610
Post-Pre	Responsive	1.509	-0.949	1.242	0.525

Appendix G

Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Classifications

Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory Classification

Type of Counseling Relationship	(Raw Score +100) Converted Score Range
(E) Excellent	+ 148-130
(AV) Above Average	+ 129-111
(A) Average	+ 110-90
(BA) Below Average	+ 89-71
(P) Poor	+ 70-52